

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12862) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the World War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 12863) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Warren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 12864) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Pleasantville, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 12865) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 390) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Resolution (H. Res. 446) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 12817; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 12866) for the relief of Thomas N. Emley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 12867) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 12868) for the relief of Bernard Joseph Maley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12869) for the relief of Frank A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12870) granting a pension to John H. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12871) granting an increase of pension to Ruben Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12872) granting a pension to Thomas Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12873) granting an increase of pension to Paul Claire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 12874) granting a pension to Robert Clyde McBride; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12875) granting a pension to Tracey M. Halley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12876) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hawthorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12877) granting a pension to Jennie Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12878) granting a pension to Emma Van Duyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12879) granting a pension to Ella Knowlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12880) granting a pension to Margaret J. Essex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12881) granting a pension to James A. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12882) granting an increase of pension to James H. Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 12883) granting a pension to Bertha Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 12884) for the relief of John N. Halladay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 12885) granting a pension to Susan B. Cantlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12886) to reimburse E. W. Hardendorf for supplies furnished the submarine chaser No. 328; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12887) granting a pension to Jacob F. Rosenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 12888) granting a pension to Lizzie C. Masters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 12889) granting a pension to William B. Kimbrel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLK: A bill (H. R. 12890) for the relief of George E. Doty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12891) granting a pension to John F. Kilbride; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6420. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of San Francisco Labor Council, regarding the impeachment of the Attorney General and Federal Judge Wilkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6421. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., favoring adjusted compensation for soldiers of the late war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6422. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., favoring retirement of enlisted men of the Army after 25 years' service with retired pay of not less than \$100 per month and allowances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6423. Also, petition of the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of S. 1565, providing for retirement under certain conditions of officers of the United States Army, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6424. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Armenian Committee, of New Orleans, La., favoring freedom of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6425. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of Creston Avenue Baptist Church, New York City, regarding the Turkish situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6426. By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution of the Women's Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in regard to the proposed all-the-year national park in southern New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6427. Also, petition of the South Congregational Church of Utica, N. Y., favoring adequate protection of the minority population under Turkish rule and asking representation on the part of the United States in Near East affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, November 22, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, Thou hast been with us in the days gone by. Thou art still the helper of those who trust in Thee. We can rely upon Thine own strong arm, Thy wisdom, and Thy graciousness in all the perplexities and burdens of life. Give us light in our darkness, strength in our weakness, and hope in our despondency, and ever lead us onward through the mazes and contradictions of possible trouble. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, and CHARLES A. RAWSON, a Senator from the State of Iowa, appeared in their seats to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Fletcher	McKellar	Simmons
Bayard	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Smith
Borah	Glass	McNary	Smoot
Brandegge	Gooding	Nelson	Spencer
Broussard	Hale	Nicholson	Stanfield
Cameron	Harrell	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Harris	Overman	Sutherland
Caraway	Harrison	Page	Swanson
Colt	Heflin	Pepper	Trammell
Culberson	Hitchcock	Pittman	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kellogg	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Ladd	Rawson	Warren
Edge	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Ernst	Lodge	Sheppard	
Felton	McCumber	Shortridge	

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12859) to provide for certain expenses incident to the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3300. An act granting a pension to Marie Doughty Gorgas;
H. R. 307. An act for the relief of J. Irving Brooks; and
H. R. 10144. An act conveying the peninsula of Presque Isle, Erie, Pa., to the State of Pennsylvania, its original owner, for public park purposes.

ADDRESS BY MRS. REBECCA LATIMER FELTON, SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mrs. FELTON. Mr. President, in my very remarkable campaign in Georgia, which, contrary to precedent, all came along after I was selected, one of the very amusing things that came to me by mail was a cartoon from San Antonio, Tex. The cartoon represented the United States Senate in session. The seats seemed to be fully occupied, and there appeared in the picture the figure of a woman who had evidently entered without sending in her card. The gentlemen in the Senate took the situation variously. Some seemed to be a little bit hysterical, but most of them occupied their time looking at the ceiling. Over the cartoon was written the wonderful words, "Will they ask the lady to take a chair?" [Laughter.] I want to return my thanks to-day for the beautiful, hospitable welcome that you have accorded to the lady when you gave her a chair.

I also want to return thanks to the noble men of Georgia. Georgia was very slow in her promises with reference to woman's suffrage. She has been rapid to perform, for Georgia is the first State in the Federal Union composed of 48 States where one chivalric governor went to the front and said, "Send that old lady there and let her look at the Senate for even a day."

The Senator elect from Georgia, Mr. GEORGE, said, "She shall have her day there," and I want to thank him in this presence. He is a worthy successor. I want to plead for your gracious attention to him. He has been most chivalric. The sitting Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has been most obliging. Indeed, I feel that I am the happiest woman in the United States. I am at home in the Senate for a day. I appreciate this wonderful hospitality and the beautiful attention thus accorded to me.

I want to say further that I commend to your attention the 10,000,000 women voters who are watching this incident. It is a romantic incident, Senators, but it is also a historical event. If Lady Astor, from the State of Virginia, can go to London and be accepted as a member of the British House of Commons, you can take this remnant of the old South that has never flickered in her patriotism to her country and be very well assured that she is not going to discredit her commission.

Let me say, Mr. President, that when the women of the country come in and sit with you, though there may be but very few in the next few years, I pledge you that you will get ability, you will get integrity of purpose, you will get exalted patriotism, and you will get unstinted usefulness.

Mr. President and Senators, I thank you very much for this hearing. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I present the credentials of WALTER F. GEORGE, Senator elect from the State of Georgia. I ask that his credentials may be read and that the oath of office be administered to him.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, WALTER F. GEORGE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of the late Senator THOMAS E. WATSON, ending March 4, 1927.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Thomas W. Hardwick, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1922.

THOMAS W. HARDWICK, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

S. G. MCLENDON,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator elect from Georgia will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. GEORGE, escorted by Mr. HARRIS, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

EXPENSES OF THIRD SESSION, SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

The bill (H. R. 12859) to provide for certain expenses incident to the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress was read twice by its title.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations have already been in consultation in reference to the bill which has just been referred to that committee, and I am directed to report it favorably and to ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill just reported. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, after line 11, under the head of "Senate," it is proposed to insert:

For 16 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each from November 20, 1922, to December 3, 1922, both dates inclusive, \$560.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDELL.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on November 10 last in New York, at the meeting of the National Merchant Marine Association held at the Grand Central Palace, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] made a very instructive and interesting address relative to aid for shipping. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Record in the regular 8-point type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type as follows:

"To the members of the National Merchant Marine Association and to the other friends of the American merchant marine here to-night, I want to express, with all the emphasis in my power, my firm conviction that the problem of American shipping can not properly be regarded as a partisan issue, and that to treat it on the basis of politics will be disastrous not only to the merchant marine but to the Nation as well.

"Our shipping is no more a Republican or a Democratic institution than our Army or our Navy, to each of which it constitutes an indispensable adjunct held in reserve. It can no more be dispensed with than they can. It is not a luxury but a national necessity, for in it are combined a weapon of defense for the American Nation and an instrument to safeguard American industry.

"No matter what party might have been in power during the war, an expanded merchant marine must have been provided. No matter what party is in power now, our new-born merchant marine must be maintained. For just as no party truly representative of the American people could have shirked the responsibility of meeting the war need of providing ships to protect our fighting forces, so no party with the interests of the Nation at heart can now shirk the responsibility of keeping our flag on the seas.

"It was under a Democratic administration that the millions of tons of ships we now have were built. It is under a Republican administration that their future must be provided for. And if the American merchant marine fails, if it is abandoned and our place on the seas is surrendered to foreigners, together with our control of our own commerce, such a result must bring discredit to the Democracy that fathered the fleet, as well as to the Republicans that adopted it.

"I need not emphasize to you that failure is inevitable unless prompt steps are taken to equip our merchant marine so that

the increasingly successful competition of foreigners can be met. Following the war the bulk of our imports and exports was carried in American ships, whereas to-day two-thirds of our overseas trade is transported by foreign vessels. In this change are reflected the steps whereby other nations, with their cheaper built and cheaper operated ships, aided by national support, have taken our carrying trade away from us. Our elimination as a commercial sea power of importance is inevitable unless vigorous legislation is promptly enacted that will enable us to regain our rightful place on the seas.

"Legislation designed to meet the situation has been prepared and is awaiting action by Congress. It provides for American shipping what every other maritime nation of importance has given to its merchant marine—subsidization. In addition, other aids are specified, calculated not only to benefit the ship and the shipper but the manufacturer, merchant, farmer, labor, and the Nation as a whole.

"I hear it stated from time to time that the Democratic Party can not support a plan of subsidy because the policies of the party are fundamentally opposed to such a policy. History, however, shows us that the very reverse is true. Under the early shipping policies of the Democracy the American merchant marine was developed to a point of efficiency and power beyond the trade fleets of all other nations. Under the laws framed by the founders of the Republic we had discriminating duties in favor of goods carried in American vessels, and as a result of these we transported nine-tenths of our exports and imports under our own flag for many years. Just before the late war, however, conditions had become exactly reversed, and it was the foreigner who carried the nine-tenths of our ocean commerce.

"What had happened? In the period from 1828 to 1850 we gradually gave up discriminations against the vessels of those nations which agreed not to discriminate against us. And then, when our hands were tied, foreign nations began to take up effectively the subsidization of their own vessels and our sea power began to wane.

"It was the Democracy which stepped into the breach at this crisis in American shipping affairs and initiated the American policy of ship subsidies. Two southern statesmen began it—Senator Thomas Butler King, of Georgia, and Senator Thomas J. Rusk, of Texas. Both advocated annual appropriations for the carrying of mails and the encouragement of American steamship building and navigation. President Polk stood strongly for this policy, and in 1845 and 1847 Congress passed legislation to this end. As to the effectiveness of this step inaugurated by the Democratic Party let me offer some Republican testimony from the majority report of the Merchant Marine Commission of 1904-5. That body was appointed by Congress and headed by the late Senator Gallinger. The report says:

"As a result of this enlightened statesmanship, the United States from 1850 onward for several years built more ocean steamships than Great Britain did, and better steamships, superior in size, speed, power, and commercial value. * * * The national policy thus approved would doubtless have continued unbroken to the present day but for the fierce and deplorable sectional quarrel that immediately preceded the Civil War. * * * In the white heat of this quarrel the mail subventions were withdrawn and the North Atlantic steamships, struggling hard with subsidized British rivals, were abandoned.

"The report continues—

"It is sometimes said that this national effort to create a steam fleet by mail subventions failed of its purpose. But it failed only because the effort was given up in the very crisis of the contest. A few years more would probably have made our steamships as securely masters of the North Atlantic as our packet ships and clipper ships had been before them.

"This tribute to subsidization, penned nearly 20 years ago, has an even greater bearing to-day than then, for now we have a mighty nucleus in hand for a mighty fleet. The ships are here, but they must be vested with competitive power before it is too late. Support of subsidy will not be an abandonment of Democratic policies but a renewal of the very ones on which the American merchant marine was set forth on a voyage to sea supremacy that ended with the goal in sight, and only then because the sailing orders were canceled. Let us not make this mistake again."

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have a communication from the National Board of Farm Organizations transmitting certain resolutions adopted by that organization on the subject referred to in the address which has just been ordered printed in the RECORD. I ask that the communication may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
November 21, 1922.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: The National Board of Farm Organizations has taken a very strong position on the so-called ship subsidy measure. A copy of our resolutions against this bill is inclosed herewith.

Respectfully yours,

NATIONAL BOARD OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS,
By CHAS. A. LYMAN, Secretary.

REPORT OF MEETING OCTOBER 11, 12, 13, 1922.

NATIONAL BOARD FARM ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1922.

SHIP SUBSIDY OPPOSED BY NATIONAL BOARD OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS.

Ship subsidy in general and ship subsidy in particular as embodied in the Jones-Greene bill H. R. 12021 are emphatically opposed by the National Board of Farm Organizations.

Clear-cut opposition to the ship subsidy bill is expressed in the resolution adopted by the semiannual conference of the National Board of Farm Organizations, held at its headquarters, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., October 11-13. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas it is apparent that the question of granting subsidies to our merchant shipping will soon be brought to a vote in Congress; and

"Whereas the farmers of the United States have been traditionally opposed to the granting of such subsidies; and

"Whereas the plan embodied in the Jones-Greene bill, which is now under consideration, contains many provisions that are extremely objectionable and would, in our opinion, be detrimental to the best interest of the country as a whole, if enacted: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this body record an emphatic protest against the passage of this proposed legislation."

This opposition to the ship subsidy bill confirms the position taken by the directors of the National Board of Farm Organizations in regularly called session, July 5-6, in which it was stated that "the board desires emphatically to go on record against the ship subsidy bill, known as H. R. 12021." The resolution adopted at that time, in part, stated:

"Wherever bona fide groups of organized farmers have assembled in the past to consider this long-agitated question of ship subsidy the sentiment against it has been overwhelming; and during the recent months as farmers have been learning of this particular measure their voices have been raised against it more forcibly than ever.

"In addition to being opposed in principle to subsidizing private shippers or shipping corporations we wish to point out a few of the many objectionable features of the bill.

"Unprecedented and unwarranted autocratic powers are vested in the Shipping Board, as may be gathered from the fact that it is not required to make any financial accounting to Congress or the President, while at the same time it is permitted to sell Government-owned ships at private sale without competitive bidding.

"Ships costing several billions of dollars can and probably will be sold at 10 cents on the dollar, it is estimated. We shall lend over \$100,000,000 at 2 per cent interest to recondition these ships when sold, and then pay the owners in round numbers, \$150,000,000 in subsidies besides in the next few years.

The National Board of Farm Organizations protests the contemplated program, the effect of which can only end in disaster to the Nation. We earnestly request Congress to reject the measure."

PETITIONS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of students of the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, of the Kansas State Agricultural College, at Manhattan, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation granting 50 cents per day to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS presented resolutions adopted by the Presbyterian Church of New Harrisburg; the Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Reformed, Church of Christ, and Lutheran Churches of Carrollton; the Methodist Episcopal and the Methodist Protestant Churches of Arlington; the Methodist Protestant, Methodist Episcopal, and Presbyterian Churches of Forrest; the Presbyterian, the Methodist Episcopal, the Lutheran, and Church of Christ Churches of Minerva; the Methodist, the Protestant Episcopal, the Evangelical Reformed, the English Lutheran, and the Presbyterian Churches of Upper Sandusky; and the Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal Churches of Malvern, all in the State of Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Rev. W. E. Watson and 200 other citizens of Steubenville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the so-called Dyer antilynching bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Pittsburgh and the Conemaugh Presbytery at Shelocta, both in the State of Pennsylvania, praying an amendment of the Constitution authorizing the enactment of uniform marriage and divorce laws, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Conemaugh Presbytery at Shelocta and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Pittsburgh, both in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring an amendment of the Constitution prohibiting polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Conemaugh Presbytery at Shelocta; the united churches of Mifflintown, the united Protestant churches of Lewistown, the Lutheran Church of Georgetown, the united Presbyterian churches of Middleburg, the united churches of Reedsville, the Church of the Brethren of Huntingdon, and St. Peter's Reformed Church of Kelly Township, Union County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LADD presented the petitions of Mrs. Mable Filbin and 7 others, of Steele; J. N. Horgan and 17 others, of Neche; Seb Urlaub and 9 others, of Leroy; Mrs. Bert Johnson and 25 others, of Flaxton; Mrs. Clara Niles and 9 others, of Barton; Andrew Hamark and 5 others, of Hamar; Frank J. Lyon and 18 others, of Dogden; Andrew Ornhold and 13 others, of Williston; A. A. Delzer and 8 others, of Zeeland; Erwin Mattson and 9 others, of Fullerton; Peter Fincher and 11 others, of Menoken; Henry N. Hoganson and 2 others, of Lisbon; J. E. Kiefer and 42 others, of Hague; Mrs. J. O. Olson and 6 others, of White Earth; George Kunrath and 29 others, of Oakes; William Oelke and 7 others, of Hazen; C. P. Christianson and 30 others, of Bowbells; Mrs. H. B. French and 11 others, of Bowman; Mrs. J. C. Hopkins and 16 others, of Ryder; J. F. Clemans and 8 others, of Adrian; all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the price of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4043) for the relief of Wyatt A. Marshall; and

A bill (S. 4044) authorizing the cancellation of the Indian trust patent which issued to Justine Sayers; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. STERLING (for Mr. ODDIE):

A bill (S. 4045) to regulate and control unincorporated cooperative contract loan, savings, and investment institutions operating under declarations of trust in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4046) granting a pension to James R. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 4047) providing for a readjustment of the rates of pay of chief pay clerks and chief pharmacists; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4048) to pay \$7,500 to Georgia Durham Watson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4049) for the relief of Joseph Edmund Hanlon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4051) to reinstate the lapsed term and converted insurance of Edward Owens Holloway; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4052) to amend the retirement laws affecting certain grades of Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4053) for the relief of Edward Owens Holloway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 246) providing for the delivery of mail notwithstanding failure to provide receptacles therefor; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ADDITIONAL SENATE PAGES.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 363), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to employ five additional pages for the Senate Chamber, to serve from November 20, 1922, to March 31, 1923, and to be paid at the rate of \$2.50 per day each out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

MERGER OF MEAT PACKERS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer a Senate resolution and ask to have it read and that it then lie upon the table to be called up by me at the earliest opportunity.

The resolution (S. Res. 364) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and hereby is, requested to report immediately to the Senate all information now in his possession relating to any proposed merger or mergers of large meat-packing companies, accompanying said report with a statement of the number of animals annually slaughtered under Federal inspection since January 1, 1919, and the proportion slaughtered by each of the five principal packers with their subsidiary and affiliated companies; also to report what action, if any, he has taken or contemplates taking in reference to such proposed merger.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR WATSON OF GEORGIA.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 365), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. THOMAS E. WATSON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

COMPENSATION AND MILEAGE OF SENATOR FELTON, OF GEORGIA.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 366), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to REBECCA LATIMER FELTON \$287.67 for compensation, and \$280 as mileage, the same being amounts due her as a Senator from the State of Georgia from November 8 to November 21, 1922.

MANUFACTURERS OF MAIL RECEPTACLES, ETC.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 367), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the United States Senate the names of manufacturers of covers for door slots and also for mail receptacles for use of United States City Delivery Mail Service under requirements of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General will include also the number of such slots or receptacles manufactured by each manufacturer since July 1, 1922, and the number now in process of manufacture.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to introduce a concurrent resolution and to be permitted to make a brief statement relative thereto. Yesterday in the message of the President—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the resolution which the Senator submits a Senate resolution?

Mr. CARAWAY. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to ask, if it is a Senate resolution, that the Senator withhold it until the present order before the Senate may be completed.

Mr. CARAWAY. I will take only a moment of the time of the Senate.

Yesterday the President in his message asked that the Congress which he convened in extraordinary session should disregard the expressed wishes of the people as disclosed in the recent election and pass a ship subsidy bill. He says:

In individual exchanges of opinion not a few in House or Senate have expressed personal sympathy with the purpose of the bill and then uttered a discouraging doubt about the sentiment of their constituencies.

The President then says it would be discouraging—I am not quoting him literally, but in effect—if the Congress should heed a mandate from the people and refuse to pass legislation which was desired by certain interests. That is in effect the statement of the President which appears in his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

The President's exact language is as follows:

Having discussed in detail the policy and provisions of the pending bill when previously addressing you, I forbear a repetition now. In individual exchanges of opinion not a few in House or Senate have expressed personal sympathy with the purposes of the bill and then uttered a discouraging doubt about the sentiment of their constituencies. It would be most discouraging if a measure of such transcending national importance must have its fate depend on geographical, occupational, professional, or partisan objections. Frankly, I think it loftier statesmanship to support and commend a policy designed to effect the larger good to the Nation than merely to record the too hasty impressions of a constituency.

With that idea in view, Mr. President, I present a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate, the House concurring, that Members who have been repudiated by their constituencies should not by their votes attempt to fasten upon the people legislation which the people themselves at the polls have tried to repudiate.

In this connection permit me to say that for those Members of the Senate who go out, either because they were not candidates for reelection or because their people chose others in their stead, I have nothing but the kindest feeling, and I present the concurrent resolution not to reflect upon them or upon the ninety-odd Members of the House who were left at home by the will of the sovereign people, but to call attention to the wrongfulness of trying to pass through the Congress at an extraordinary session legislation that the people have sought to prevent. It was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution that legislation should be jammed through Congress after the general election and before the convening of the Congress elected in the November elections.

The length of time allotted discloses, if no other argument were available, that the expectation of the framers of the Constitution was that the legislation enacted in the short session of Congress should be merely routine legislation, such as the passing of appropriation bills and measures of that kind. Now, with an adverse mandate from the people against the proposed ship subsidy bill, the President calls Congress in extraordinary session and, in effect, says to its Members, "Do not regard the mandate of the people; listen to me. The people have already ordered your retirement to private life; the only hope you may entertain to continue on the Federal pay roll is an appointment, and the only man who can make that appointment is the President of the United States. Therefore, disregard the mandate of the people; jam through this legislation; fasten upon the backs of the American people \$100,000,000 annually in subsidies and then look for help to the Executive, who alone can keep you from being compelled to earn a living as a private citizen." That is what the President's utterances mean; that is what the President was trying to say in as diplomatic language as the President knows how to say it—"Disregard the people; they have already repudiated you; look to me; the power yet rests in my hands to reward you if you hear my voice and disregard the voice of the people. A ship subsidy for my friends and an appointment for you."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Without discussing the question whether it would be better for the country and wiser that the old Congress should not legislate upon general subjects after the election of a new Congress and before the new Congress has qualified to legislate, what can the Senator cite to sustain his statement—

Mr. CARAWAY. That we have a constitutional right to forbid them to do it?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No. If the Senator will be kind enough to wait until I frame my question—

Mr. CARAWAY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was through.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What authority can the Senator cite to substantiate his statement that it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution that the old Congress, some Members of which had been defeated, should be limited in their power to the passage of appropriation bills only and should not engage in any other legislation?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, well, the length of time—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; the Senator said, if I understood him correctly, that the framers of the Constitution never intended that the old Congress should legislate upon anything but appropriation bills.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I want to know what authority the Senator can quote as to the intention of the framers of the Constitution in that respect.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator asks me a question and then will not let me answer it because he is so anxious to repeat it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, no; the Senator has all the time there is to answer it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Not so long as the Senator is alive, because he will take most of it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator did not happen to have it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator yielded to me.

Mr. CARAWAY. I referred, Mr. President, to the brief duration of the short session. The President himself realized that

fact and dared not wait until the first Monday in December, when by law and under the Constitution the old Congress would reconvene, but did what no other President ever did in the history of the country, called Congress into a third session in order that they might pass this legislation in the present Congress, for he knows, and every man who may vote for this unholy subsidy knows, that if the time shall slip by until the Congress that was elected by the people last November may have an opportunity to pass upon it Congress will repudiate it. It does not need any argument to show that it was not intended that this Congress should do it. The life of the present Congress is so limited that even the President and the framers of the ship subsidy measure knew they could not pass it in the regular session of Congress, and so the President called this extraordinary session.

The concurrent resolution goes a little further, Mr. President. It suggests that chairmen of various committees out of harmony with the mandate of the people should not longer continue to be chairmen of those committees and obstruct the will of the people. This is a representative form of government; we hold our commissions from the people, and we have absolutely no moral right to vote contrary to their wishes, if they have had an opportunity at the polls to express their wishes. The President's entreaty that Senators and Representatives should disregard this mandate, I think, makes it opportune—indeed, imperative—that the Senate should say to him that we recognize the people are our masters and not the President of these United States, and that he has no power, no moral right, to absolve us from our obligation to the people, and should not ask us to betray the people and listen to him in order that he may fasten upon the people legislation that he knows the people repudiated on the 7th day of November, 1922. If this be not true, let this ship subsidy bill rest until the Congress that was elected in 1922 shall have an opportunity to express its views.

Why, even Senator Newberry—the man who paid the highest price for a seat that ever a seat in the Senate brought—had the good taste to say, when repudiated by the people of Michigan by the rejection of his colleague, who had supported his contention, that he had been repudiated by the people and that he ought not to participate longer in the making of legislation when his people did not want him to do it, and he resigned. Should other men have less consideration for the wishes of the people than Senator Newberry, who undertook to buy a seat in the Senate?

Mr. President, I presume that by ordinary parliamentary procedure the concurrent resolution would go to the Committee on the Judiciary; but I wish to ask that it be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. [Laughter.] I wish to say for the consideration of the Senators who laughed, because they did not know what they laughed about, that if the concurrent resolution goes to the Committee on the Judiciary I have every reason to believe that it will slumber there, as some other resolutions that I introduced found a morgue there; and I should like to have the Senate itself pass upon this one. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there be objection, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas this is a representative government speaking for and interpreting the will of the people of the United States as expressed at the polls; and

Whereas no Representative in either branch of Congress has the moral right to support or vote for any measure which the people by their votes have repudiated; and

Whereas certain proposed legislation affecting a fundamental change in our economic and commercial policy is now recommended by the Executive for consideration by Congress; and

Whereas this proposed legislation has failed to receive the approval of the voters as evidenced by the elections recently held; and

Whereas Congress has been called into extraordinary session for the purpose of passing this legislation which the people have by imperative and unmistakable mandate repudiated; and

Whereas a Congress which adopts legislation in defiance of a popular mandate to the contrary would perpetrate an act of usurpation; and

Whereas many advocates of the ship subsidy bill in the present Congress have been rejected by emphatic majorities by their constituents; and

Whereas it is unwise to place in the hands of rejected public servants the power to adopt fundamental legislation; and

Whereas a sense of official propriety would suggest to the defeated Members the unwisdom of participating in legislation which, if enacted, would materially affect fundamental questions of public policy: Therefore be it

Resolved, I. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) that all Members defeated at the recent polls abstain from voting on any but routine legislation, such as necessary supply bills, motions to adjourn, or motions to recess, and

such other legislation as does not involve any material change of national policy.

II. That chairmen of committees, not in sympathy with the people's wishes as expressed at the polls, and who have an important effect on legislation, resign from their respective chairmanships so their places may be filled by those who are known to be willing to carry into legislative effect the mandate of the people as expressed at the polls on the 7th day of November, 1922.

III. That the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) reaffirm their readiness to bow to the people's will, when expressed at the polls, and declare that the vote of want of confidence in the leaders which has been registered shall not be disregarded.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN OIL LEASES.

Mr. WALSH of Montana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 368), which was read:

Whereas under the act of Congress, approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," it is provided:

Sec. 27. That no person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold more than one coal, phosphate, or sodium lease during the life of such lease in any one State; no person, association, or corporation shall take or hold, at one time, more than three oil or gas leases granted hereunder in any one State, and not more than one lease within the geologic structure of the same producing oil or gas field; no corporation shall hold any interest as a stockholder of another corporation in more than such number of leases; and no person or corporation shall take or hold any interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease under the provisions hereof, which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding of a lease under this act, or which, together with any other interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease under the provisions hereof, for any kind of mineral leased hereunder, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kinds of minerals allowed to any one lessee under this act. Any interests held in violation of this act shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in the United States district court for the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located, except that any ownership or interest forbidden in this act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years and not longer after its acquisition: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit sections 18, 18a, 19, and 22, or to prevent any number of leases under the provisions of this act from combining their several interests so far as may be necessary for the purposes of constructing and carrying on the business of a refinery, or of establishing and constructing as a common carrier a pipe line or lines of railroads to be operated and used by them jointly in the transportation of oil from their several wells, or from the wells of other lessees under this act, or the transportation of coal: *Provided further*, That any combination for such purpose or purposes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior on application to him for permission to form the same: *And provided further*, That if any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this act shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form part of, or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with consent of lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, or sodium entered into by the lessee, or any agreement or understanding, written, verbal, or otherwise to which such lessee shall be a party, of which his or its output is to be or become the subject, to control the price or prices thereof or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control, in excess of the amounts of lands provided in this act, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings; and

Whereas it is currently reported that notwithstanding the provisions of the said act above quoted, by sundry devices certain individuals, acting in concert through the same or separate corporate organizations, or otherwise, actually, though they may not nominally, hold oil or gas leases issued under the said act in number greater than three in each of several States and greater than one within the geologic structure of each of a number of producing oil or gas fields, and that such interests in fact exercise control over the greater portion of the output of a number of such fields, in so far as the same issues from lands leased under the said act, the number of leases covering lands in such fields, being greatly in excess of three: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys or any subcommittee it may designate for the purposes be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed:

1. To inquire—

(a) Into all leases issued under the said act, to whom the same were issued, to whom the same or any rights thereunder were assigned or otherwise transferred, and the members of any association or the stockholders of any corporation acquiring such leases or any rights thereunder, at the time and since the same were acquired, with the business relation, if any, between any such associations or corporations, and how far, if at all, any two or more are controlled by one and the same management by a common stock ownership or otherwise.

(b) The area embraced in such leases and the State and geologic structure within which the lands embraced therein lie.

(c) Any contracts entered into by the holders of any such leases or any interest therein for the disposition of any oil or gas issuing from the lands embraced therein and the various parties through which the same or the products thereof pass before reaching the consumer, with the relation of any such parties to each other.

2. To report to the Senate the facts developed by such inquiry; and

3. To recommend such action by Congress or the executive departments, or both, as shall to the committee seem appropriate to accomplish the purpose of the statute above referred to and to prevent evasion of its provisions.

The said committee is hereby authorized to sit and perform its duties at such times and places as it deems necessary or proper and to require the attendance of witnesses by subpoenas or otherwise; to require the production of books, papers, and documents, and to employ stenographers, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses and sign subpoenas for witnesses; and every person duly summoned before said committee or any subcommittee thereof who refuses

or fails to obey the process of said committee or appears and refuses to answer questions pertinent to said investigation shall be punished as prescribed by law. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers of the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, those of us who were in some measure responsible for the legislation referred to conceived, at the time it was enacted, that by the provisions incorporated in the resolution we had insured the people of the country against the monopolization of these valuable lands of the Government and made certain that the interests which would be acquired under it would be distributed widely throughout the country, affording the people much-needed competition in the matter of the products of crude oil. Notwithstanding that, it is currently reported, as recited in the resolution, that at least in a number of the Western States a complete control exists in a great corporation and its allied interests of not only these Government leases but of the entire production of crude oil in this section of the country.

In a report made by the Federal Trade Commission to the Congress under date of June 30, 1921, certain conclusions are recited, among which are the following:

1. The geographic isolation of the Wyoming oil fields with reference to the prolific midcontinent and California fields and the absence of pipe-line transportation to the large consuming centers makes it necessary for the Wyoming producer to sell his crude petroleum to local refining companies.

2. There is greater concentration in the control of the production of crude petroleum in the Wyoming oil fields than in any other field in the United States.

3. From 1917-1919 the Midwest Refining interests and the Ohio Oil Co. controlled from 93 to 97 per cent of the Wyoming production.

The most prolific field in the State of Wyoming at the present time is the Salt Creek field. I am advised that it embraces an area of some 22,000 acres, of which no more than 2,000 acres, at the outside, are held in private ownership, the other 20,000 acres being held under leases issued under the provisions of the act of 1920. If, then, Mr. President, the Midwest Oil Co. controls from 93 to 97 per cent of the oil production of the State of Wyoming, the conclusion seems irresistible that it controls very much more of the production of the Salt Creek field than it is conceived it could control if the provisions of the act of 1920 were carried out according to the spirit of that law.

The situation is not much different in my own State, and the Salt Creek field in the State of Wyoming is adjacent to the Montana oil territory. The railroad commission of the State of Montana, acting as a public-service commission for my State, made complaint some time ago to the Federal Trade Commission of the exorbitant prices to which our people were subject in purchasing gasoline. It appeared that notwithstanding Montana had become an important producer of crude oil and the adjacent territory in the State of Wyoming was producing fabulously, the people of Montana were obliged to pay for gasoline a higher price than that paid by the people of any other State in the Union.

The subject was investigated by the Federal Trade Commission and the facts found as I have recited them. In the investigation by it conducted, though not directly in line with that contemplated in the resolution, the Federal Trade Commission found, among other things, that the production of crude oil and the refining of gasoline in the States of Montana and Wyoming are controlled by the Midwest Refining Co., either directly or through its subsidiary or affiliated companies. Montana is producing now from three different fields—the Cat Creek field, the Soap Creek field, and the Kevin field—the Cat Creek field being the field first brought in and up to the present time the most prolific producer. A large portion of the area within that field had passed into private ownership before it was conceived that it was valuable for the oil contained therein. But something over 10 per cent, at least, of the production now issues from lands which are operated under Government leases.

I shall not detain the Senate at this time to discuss the actual situation, but it is not substantially different from that recited in the report of the Federal Trade Commission. It seems inconceivable, Mr. President, that that company can control the production of these fields unless in some way or other it has acquired interests in violation of the act of 1920.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I feel that the Senate ought to be advised as to what the facts are, that it may be guided and governed in its future attitude toward this law. The resolution, of course, must go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but I believe that it would be advisable that a preliminary inquiry should be had by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and I shall ask that it be referred to that committee for its consideration. Upon the coming in of the report of that committee I shall ask the further reference of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, if the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys decide that they will go ahead with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A FARMERS' RURAL CREDIT BANK—WHO SHALL CONTROL IT, FARMERS OR BANKERS?

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a copy of a program of the forty-second annual meeting of the Academy of Political Science, to be held in Hotel Astor, New York City, on the 23d and 24th of this month. According to the program this annual meeting is to be given over to the discussion of the money problem. I make no apology for taking the time of the Senate to make certain observations at this time, because I believe there are certain movements going on that are of tremendous import to the people of this country. They demand discussion now; a little delay and it will be too late.

First, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the personnel of the committee on program and arrangements for this forty-second annual meeting.

Samuel McCune Lindsay is chairman ex officio. Professor Lindsay is an author and educator on economic and financial matters, and his activities date back many years. In 1892 he was a special agent of the Senate Finance Committee to report on wholesale prices in Europe. His writings place him on record as to his financial theories, beliefs, and alignments.

E. E. Agger is another educator connected with Columbia University.

Irving T. Bush, of New York, of the Bush Terminal Co. and other Bush interests, is a business man with connections of great international trade interests.

Nicholas Murray Butler, the president of Columbia University, has been sufficiently eulogized on this floor, and very little speculation is necessary to determine as to his sympathies and connections.

Waddill Catchings, of 60 Wall Street, New York City, formerly in the export department of J. P. Morgan & Co. and now of important connections in the iron and steel industry, was a member of the advisory council of administration of war labor of the Department of Labor and was chairman of the war committee of the chamber of commerce.

Frederick Cunliffe-Owen, connected with the New York Tribune.

Will H. Hays, a lawyer, of Sullivan, Ind., who became distinguished when he was appointed chairman of the Republican National Committee, and later official censor of the motion-picture industry.

J. W. Jenks, an economist whose views and affiliations are very well known.

Joseph French Johnson, formerly financial editor of the Chicago Tribune, and rather prominently identified with the now more or less discredited monetary commission.

E. W. Kemmerer, another economist who was connected with the monetary commission, and who holds the distinction of having been in 1917 financial adviser to the Government of Mexico. The financial affairs of Mexico are still in a very bad condition, I believe. They probably will be so long as Mexico depends upon the international bankers of Wall Street to set her house in order.

BIG FINANCIERS INTERESTED.

Thomas W. Lamont, another bulwark of the house of Morgan. Ogden L. Mills, who was a member of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, and who probably obtained his experience as a practical farmer in connection with the handling of his affairs in the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, the Lackawanna Steel Co., the Mergenthaler Linotype Co., Shredded Wheat Co., Crex Carpet Co., the New York Trust Co., and various other matters in which his millions are interested. As a practical farmer, conversant with the needs of the farmer, he should be amply qualified—from the bankers' viewpoint.

George W. Perkins, jr., the son of another financier of J. P. Morgan distinction, and known to the International Harvester Co., United States Steel Corporation, great maritime and railway interests, and various other of the biggest interests in the country.

L. S. Rowe, the popular head of the Pan American Union, whom the Washington newspapers' society columns note as being very busily engaged in the giving and attending of interesting dinners and other social events.

Henry R. Seager, another economist—spelled in capital letters—connected with Columbia University.

E. R. A. Seligman, another professor and economist, whose hand has been laid heavily upon the American people and about whom more will be said later.

FEDERAL RESERVE INTERESTED.

Benjamin Strong, the governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and who figured so prominently in the hearings before the Joint Committee of Agricultural Inquiry, and who has the courage to believe that his bank is not a governmental but a private institution.

Frank A. Vanderlip, about whom volumes could be written. We will have to content ourselves with saying that the records will show that he first came into prominence while holding a fiduciary position as Assistant Secretary of the United States Treasury. He negotiated a most questionable sale of the United States customhouse to the National City Bank of New York, of which he subsequently became president. The unrefuted statements in the public press prove this to have been a most unconscionable transaction, in which Frank A. Vanderlip, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, acted in the interest of the National City Bank and against the interests of the Government and the people of the United States. Since this occurrence he has consistently aligned himself with the money power.

Eliot Wadsworth, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in charge of foreign loans and railroad advances. We can not help but sympathize with the poor railroads; they will not have had enough of advances until the vaults of the Treasury have been turned over to them.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE AND WALL STREET FOR THE FARMERS.

Paul M. Warburg, a prince of the house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., another Money Trust firm of international bankers. It is asserted Warburg is the father of the present financial system known as the Federal reserve system. He is the gentleman who devised the trap into which was led the entire American Nation; both the Democratic and Republican Parties were entangled in the meshes of the international bankers, and they succeeded in writing into law a financial system that is rapidly forging the bonds of debt slavery upon the American people, and these two organizations, having been parties to the crime, are now silent and wedded to the system. Warburg even had the nerve and courage to boast before a Senate committee that he had been successful in his plans.

H. Parker Willis, another economist, who was pushed to the front in the enactment of the Federal reserve act, and who translated onto paper and defended the ideas promulgated by Paul M. Warburg.

There are a few others on this committee about whom I have no special information.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that anyone who had given any serious study to economic conditions in this country would find no hesitancy in reaching the conclusion that this committee on program and arrangements—with the possible exception of a few who might be mingled in for "trimmings"—is constituted of minds entirely in accordance with the banking interests. Any program arranged by this committee for the discussion of "the money problem" would naturally be arranged with a viewpoint of developing the ideas of the big bankers. There is one satisfactory and interesting observation, however, and that is that the bankers themselves realize that there is a money problem up for discussion in this country. They are not dilatory in their preparation to meet it, but seem to be feverishly trying to direct it into channels of which they approve. In view of the statement of the bankers upon the conclusion of the recent meeting of the American Bankers' Association, held in New York City, that the bankers were ready to lead the people, it is not improper to presume that this conference to be held this week is but one of their bids for leadership.

There is, however, Mr. President, one particular phase of this proposed conference that is of particular interest at this time, and it is for that reason that I am taking this opportunity to discuss it. I refer to the third session of the conference, to be held Friday afternoon at 2.30 p. m., in the north ballroom of Hotel Astor, and the topic for discussion will be "The agricultural credit problem." One would not expect to hear much of the language of the real dirt farmer amid the splendors of the north ballroom, especially when those who gather around the board possess such illustrious financial antecedents and connections.

It is, of course, not contended that the big banking interests of the country do not have a right to gather in such a discussion, but those who have the real interests of the farmer at heart also have the right to warn him against accepting such advocates for their leadership.

SAVING THE FARMER FOR THE BANKS.

Let us notice for a moment the program for this third session. It is to be presided over by Edwin R. A. Seligman, already referred to. The program is as follows:

1. Introductory address of the presiding officer.
2. Agricultural financing.—Eugene Meyer, jr., managing director War Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.; SYDNEY ANDERSON, public business permitting, Congressman from Minnesota, chairman Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry.
3. Fall in agricultural prices, causes and remedies.—George E. Roberts, vice president National City Bank, New York City.
4. Should the farmer have additional credits to enable him to hold his crops for better prices?—Jesse E. Pope, Washington, D. C.
5. Discussion.—Thomas P. Gore, former United States Senator from Oklahoma. Every cloud has a silver lining, and in this connection we are heartened that the name of former Senator Gore appears among the galaxy of intellectuals on the program. We are glad to learn that the farmers will have a friend in court and that their cause will be better and more favorably known because of his presence at the conference.

WARBURG, SELIGMAN, AND FARMERS.

Mr. President, according to that eminent authority on big financiers, Mr. B. C. Forbes, in his book, *Men Who Are Making America*, at page 403, it was in the home of Edwin R. A. Seligman where the decision was made that Paul M. Warburg should publish his views on the central bank idea, and that the propaganda should be started for the purpose of writing into our laws a financial system based upon the central bank idea as the ideal corner stone. This decision was made at a time when the country was in the throes of the financial stringency of 1907, and when the people were declaiming against the money power centralized in Wall Street—and whose ideas were to be put forth as the basis for the new currency system? Those of Paul M. Warburg, a descendant of international bankers, schooled and trained for an international banker, imported from Germany for the purpose of giving expression to the evolution of the international bankers' idea of a currency system, and a man who having come here in 1902 and become a member of that powerful firm of international banker, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., did not file his citizenship papers until he was ready to take his fight before the public, and then did not become a citizen until 1911.

BANK CREDITS AND PAUPERS.

What happened? In an attempt to distract the American people and satisfy their demands for monetary reform the monetary commission was authorized and sent abroad to investigate European systems and report to Congress a monetary plan. The commission went abroad and proceeded to interview bankers and financiers and investigate European banking systems, but they did not investigate the economic condition of the peoples who lived under the domination of these banking systems; neither did they report to Congress a monetary measure, but a bank credit measure. They found ideal banking systems, from the bankers' viewpoint and from a standpoint of banking prosperity, but they failed to show the pauperizing effects of those systems upon the peoples who endured them.

The next step was the Aldrich report, which was secretly written on Jekyll Island, and in which Mr. Warburg had such a prominent part. The Aldrich bill followed, and the Democrats rose in arms and defeated it. They deservedly received the plaudits of the Nation for their fight against the Aldrich bill and for the magnificent stand they took against the central-bank idea. The people rewarded them by placing them in power, with the mandate to effect financial reform, and that mandate was clearly against any such idea as embraced in the Aldrich bill. They conducted the Pujo investigation and exposed, in part, the Money Trust, and that disclosure showed that the firm of Paul M. Warburg—Kuhn, Loeb & Co.—was declared to be a member of that Money Trust. Notwithstanding that fact, they immediately nestled to their bosoms this self-same Warburg that had been the directing hand behind the Aldrich bill. The Aldrich bill was worked over, camouflaged, and disguised and placed before the people as a great achievement and as the means of emancipation of the people from financial slavery. The Republicans could not, had they desired, fight the measure effectually, because they were compelled to recognize the fact that it was the same proposition they had sponsored in the Aldrich bill. The result was that the voices of opposition were silenced, and the international bankers had captured both of the big political parties.

I do not know that the throwing over of George Harvey, with sympathies for the house of Morgan, and the taking on the ship of Paul M. Warburg, of the house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., by the Wilson forces had anything to do with the capture of

both parties, but I have long had my suspicions that it did have a great deal to do with it. It has long been rumored that there are two groups of the big international bankers who are continually battling silently against each other for financial domination, and there are many indications that such is true. However, that does not mean to say that they are at variance as to the system to be used, or that there is difference of opinion when it comes to the necessary legislation for their operations. In these matters they usually present a solid front, save where it obviously would be prudent to adopt a different method of procedure. Obtaining authorization for their system through legislative channels is entirely different from a fight between themselves for control of the system.

WHO CAN TELL?

All of this talk about who is the author of our present financial system is principally chatter. Some day I may deem it advisable to say something to this body about Mr. McAdoo and his connections with Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

But back to this proposed meeting in New York. We do know that Edwin R. A. Seligman, who is to preside over this rural-credit discussion, was one of the first men to figure in the plans for "putting across" the system, and he has faithfully awaited its beck and call ever since.

Then the program provides that we shall get some more instruction for the farmer from Eugene Meyer, jr., head of the War Finance Corporation, and another Wall Street manipulator. There are many indications that Mr. Meyer is greatly interested in the various cooperative movements throughout the country, and I have been informed that he has been in close cooperation with Mr. Aaron Sapiro, who has accomplished a great deal in the organization of these cooperatives, and is supposed to represent a great many of them as attorney, which representation affords a comfortable source of revenue. I have also been advised that Mr. Sapiro is very influential in obtaining aid for the cooperatives from the War Finance Corporation.

I would like to say this, Mr. President, the farmers have a great opportunity for helping themselves through the cooperative organizations; I have devoted a great deal of my life to a study of the problems of the farmer and I have long ago come to the conclusion that if he is to realize any permanent relief or aid through the cooperative movement he must be careful of his leaders. He must be sure to always keep control of his organization. Forbid the time may ever come when the unseen hand of Wall Street or any special group of financiers has the control of organized farmers in their grasp. If such come true, then their organization will prove a boomerang to come back and strike, a viper to curse and wound them in their adversity.

Then Mr. Roberts, of the great National City Bank, will also hand out some advice about the farmers; and so on, it goes.

Mr. President, I do not know whether or not this meeting proposes to go on record as favoring any special legislation, whether it will indorse a bill drawn by Mr. Meyer or one sponsored by Mr. Warburg or Mr. Roberts or anyone else. Perhaps they may now consider it inadvisable to do so.

I am convinced of this, however, that any recommendation they may make looking toward legislation for the farmer will be from the viewpoint of what is good for the bankers and not what is the best thing for the farmers.

According to the Washington Times, edition of November 21, 1922, on financial page, in an article by Harry Gusack:

Credit requirements of the live-stock industry as one phase of the rural-credits problem were discussed at a conference between Eugene Meyer, managing director of the War Finance Corporation, and a committee of the American National Livestock Association. The meeting probably will continue until to-morrow before a program adequate for that industry has been worked out to be included in the rural credit legislative program.

As a basis for the discussions, Mr. Meyer outlined three plans for farm financing as the basis for the rural-credits program. These are:

1. Provide financing through a centralized Government banking institute, operating with large Government capital and making loans somewhat as the War Finance Corporation has done—through branches or agencies.
2. Financing farm requirements through a number of financial corporations, each with moderate capital furnished partly by the Government, operating within a limited district, and relying upon its ability to sell bonds or debentures to the investing public in order to raise the necessary funds. Under this type of organization it is proposed to facilitate the sales of securities through tax exemption.
3. Take care of the financing of cooperative marketing organizations through existing financial machinery by modifying the laws and regulations governing the eligibility requirements of the Federal reserve system, and the financing of the live-stock industry by amending the national bank act so as to authorize the creation of federally chartered loan companies, operating with private capital under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency or the Federal reserve system.

Mr. President, all of these methods depend entirely upon the Federal reserve system for their success, and they can be defeated in their intended purposes by the power centralized in the 12 Federal reserve banks; and I might even say by the Second Federal Reserve Bank of New York alone, for that

bank is, in practical effect, the central bank of the United States. It is also contended that it is now a private banking institution.

If either of these methods are adopted it will eventuate in further enslavement for the farmer and a pyramiding of more debts, when another period of "drastic deflation" could wipe out the remaining equities of the farmers.

However, it is not my purpose to discuss this phase of the situation at this time, but I intend to do so if either of the propositions reach this floor.

This is but further evidence to my mind, Mr. President, that a studied effort is now being made to get a well-fortified scheme brought before this Congress that will sail right through because it will have a long list of stereotyped indorsements behind it when it reaches Congress. As usual, the plan comes through some of the same old Wall Street crowd.

The fact that Mr. Meyer has received the indorsement of two administrations whose parties, according to the record, would seem to have surrendered to Wall Street on the money question, does not justify the farmers of this Nation in placing their destiny in his hands.

CONFIDENCE AND WALL STREET.

It is not very long to hark back to the time when there was a feeling in this country that Wall Street could not be depended upon to protect the best interests of the rank and file of the country. Now it appears that all leaders, all molders of legislative thought, to be considered dependable, must hail from Wall Street. There was a time when there would be many sincere and protesting voices raised against such a condition, but now there is silence where there should be indignation and wrath. Public officials seem to be taking the viewpoint that if there is a financial task to perform it must be done by some one of Wall Street ability and qualifications.

Will we ever learn? We have accepted the bankers' idea in this country long enough. They have always brought us to debts and hard times. The bankers' system has patently proved a failure. Will we continue to swear by it? When I say a failure, I mean a failure from the standpoint of the people. It has been an eminent success from the standpoint of the banker. Debts have piled up by the billions, and they continue to pile up, and they all bear interest, and the people pay the interest. While the banks and bankers are increasing the reserves and assets, the people are going more into debt. Our present financial system will never get us out, but will persistently mount the total of indebtedness. There is not a better illustration of that fact than the increase of mortgage indebtedness upon the farms of the United States since the operation of the Federal reserve act, and not a clearer illustration of the powers of that act than the results of drastic deflation in wiping out of equities in farms throughout the entire country.

SHALL WE PREDICT THE END?

Yet, with it all, we are content to rest on our oars and let the international bankers perfect their system. Not only that, but it is quite evident to me that there will be legislation offered to this body for the alleged purpose of giving the farmers a system of rural credits, and that such legislation will depend entirely upon the Federal reserve act for its success or failure. Mr. President, there could not be a more effectual way of abandoning the interests of the farmer and setting another trap for his enslavement.

Mr. President, evidently there will be some rural credit legislation offered to this body within a short time; I wish to place the farmers on guard at this time that if they are to get any legislation that will be of lasting benefit to them it must be on a basis of real money. No system of loaning of bank credits, or rural credits, or whatever alluring name may be offered, will serve to do anything else than to push the farmer further into the quagmire of debt.

It might also be added that if there is a persistent attempt to foist such a system upon the people of this country, there will be more than 18 new faces in this body during the Sixty-ninth Congress. The farmers are tired of being duped and fooled. They have a very good idea of what they want, and they are determined to have it.

Mr. President, what I have said to-day is not designed as destructive criticism nor is it aimed at those who would honestly endeavor to restore agriculture to a profitable basis. I have, however, endeavored to raise a warning voice against that type of class legislation too often enacted for the benefit of the little group of money and credit manipulators and at the expense of that larger group—the American farmers.

Banking and financial legislation secured in the past by this same group of men, together with their administration of the laws, are now responsible for the farmers' present deplorable condition whereby they, as a class, are in five short years re-

duced from reasonable prosperity and modest comfort to bankruptcy. These farmers must now resort, as other business men do, either to the Nelson cure or stagger under the load that will in the end completely crush them and drag down other business, including the bankers, with them.

Similar meetings to the one under discussion are now being held or planned for in other parts of the country, indicating that the bankers are about, as has been stated, to take the lead for better agriculture. Will they do so? I am sorry to say the signs as indicated by the past are not good. Unless the farmers are given constructive legislation and the control of their own banking and marketing affairs is left in their own hands, there will be worse than confusion, and if we adopt a system in place thereof which continues to exact a heavy tax from the producers for the benefit of the banker, the middleman, and the retailer, I predict it will not be satisfactory either to the farmer nor will it act as a panacea stimulating greater production, which means heavy losses to the producer, and the farmer will not be slow to discover the purport or to act in an effective manner as he is now being forced to do, not only for his own protection but likewise for the benefit of the consumer and that of all society and also of the State.

LIBERIAN LOAN.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 270) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a credit with the United States for the Government of Liberia.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress I offered to the joint resolution an amendment proposing an appropriation to provide for certain inspectors of locomotive boilers. It was, I think, generally agreed upon the part of Senators that the amendment should be adopted, but while the amendment was pending a deficiency appropriation bill was brought in and considered. An amendment providing for such an appropriation was adopted by the Senate to that bill, but in conference, I think on the day before the session of Congress adjourned, the amendment was stricken out. In view of those circumstances, I desire again to offer that amendment to the joint resolution.

It has been some time since the subject was considered, and I should like to examine the amendment. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is familiar with the subject, and he made certain suggestions with respect to changing the amendment. I wish to obtain a copy of the amendment, and to prepare it so that it may be passed in proper form.

I ask the Senator from Kansas if he will be willing to let the joint resolution go over until to-morrow, in order that we may have an opportunity to look into the matter?

Mr. CURTIS. Can the Senator assure me that there will then be no debate on the amendment? The amendment was fully debated on a previous occasion.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not desire to say anything further in support of the amendment, for I think it was pretty generally agreed that it should be adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. If the amendment in the changed form in which it may be proposed will not lead to further debate, I shall be willing to let the joint resolution go over until to-morrow, for I should like to see the amendment prepared according to the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the report of the Budget Bureau.

In reference to the suggested amendment I desire to say that previously, when the matter was under consideration, I asked the Senator from Mississippi to withdraw the amendment and to propose it to the appropriation bill. He very kindly agreed to delay consideration of the amendment until the deficiency bill should be under consideration. When the deficiency bill was taken up for consideration the amendment was attached to that bill, and I assured the Senator from Mississippi at that time that if the amendment were not retained, so far as I was personally concerned, I should not object to the amendment being offered to the pending measure. In view of that fact, I am perfectly willing—for I think such action will save time and we shall thereby get a better amendment—to let the pending joint resolution go over until to-morrow, if the Senator from Mississippi will assure me that, so far as he is concerned, there will be no further debate on the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not expect to debate the amendment at all, and I do not think there will be any debate on the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] desires to say a few words in reference to another matter. As soon as he shall have concluded, I shall ask that the pending joint resolution be laid aside until tomorrow.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR NEWBERRY.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained from the Senate on yesterday when the resignation of the former junior Senator from Michigan, Mr. Newberry, was presented or I should have then said what I intend now to say.

No more loyal American ever sat in the Senate of the United States than Senator Newberry. His patient, diligent, and efficient service, coupled with his unusual experience in the naval matters of the country, has been of distinct and conspicuous help.

Some day, Mr. President, the wrong which has been done to Senator Newberry and to his family will be generally recognized and will be righted, for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in the parting blow which I am sorry to say he saw fit to give to his retiring colleague yesterday, said one thing that was undoubtedly true, and that was that "the good common sense of the American people in the end generally prevails." I may add that in the end it always does prevail; and many of those who, for one motive or another, have joined in the unwarranted and unfair attacks upon Senator Newberry will come to recognize and acknowledge the injustice which they have done.

The frank, manly statement of the junior Senator from Michigan made upon this floor in connection with his case will be accepted as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and the American people will realize that in spite of all the unjust and unfounded propaganda which has been and is promulgated in the country the essential facts are that during the entire primary campaign in 1918 in Michigan, of which criticism has been made, Senator Newberry was not present in the State of Michigan, but was constantly, during the primary campaign as well as during the general campaign, in the service of his country in the Navy, and that the large amount of money that was spent in connection with the primary—\$195,000—was collected and spent by a committee on its own authority and without Senator Newberry's knowledge or consent, and that not a dollar of the entire fund was furnished by him, and that every dollar was used for purposes of publicity, without taint of illegality or impropriety in its expenditure.

The problem in Michigan was to inform the citizens of that State of the things for which Senator Newberry stood as distinguished from the things which Mr. Henry Ford advocated—and there were thousands of patriotic, loyal citizens who believed then and believe now that the nomination of Mr. Ford would have been a national disaster.

It must be some satisfaction to the retiring Senator to know that when the conviction which sentenced him to the penitentiary upon the charge of having spent more than \$3,750 finally came to be considered by the Supreme Court of the United States that tribunal unanimously set it aside as being founded upon mistaken interpretation of law and most unfair to Mr. Newberry, and by a majority vote declared unconstitutional the very law under which the action had been taken. It must be some satisfaction to him to know that the Senate, after a protracted hearing and recount of the ballots, determined his eligibility and his qualifications for the office; but no man can overlook the propaganda, continuous and insidious, damaging to the man and his family alike, that has created in the country an atmosphere as if there were something criminal or illegal or improper in the proceedings incident to the primary election in Michigan. There is not a shadow of foundation for any such judgment.

I say, Mr. President, that the time is coming when many of the men who have been strong and earnest in their attacks—for many of them are as fair men as are upon the floor of the Senate—will recognize the injustice which they have done to the junior Senator from Michigan, whose career before the election of 1918 and during that election and since that time in the Senate of the United States has been that of a conscientious, patriotic American, of signal ability and indefatigable diligence.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not care to recall a matter which I had supposed was closed, a matter which I think had better be regarded as concluded; but, as I am present in the Chamber, I am not quite willing to have the statements of the able Senator from Missouri go unchallenged.

I wholly disagree with the view which he takes of the matter, that this money was expended without the knowledge or con-

sent of Mr. Newberry. I think the evidence is quite conclusive that it was expended both with his knowledge and with his consent. I should not mention this at all if it were not for the fact that the statement of the Senator goes into the Record, and should we who took the different view sit silent it might be regarded that we had changed our view with reference to that matter.

I think Mr. Newberry made just one mistake, and that was that he did not tender his resignation immediately after the Supreme Court passed upon the legality of the statute. He could have done so then with great propriety and gone back to his people for their view of the matter. I am of the opinion that in all probability he might have done so had he received the same advice then that he received after the election. But I do not care to go into the matter. I only wish to say, in a single sentence, that I think the record is conclusive as to the illegality of the expenditure of the money, and that the amount expended was intolerable. For Mr. Newberry individually I do not wish to speak harshly, but the system of politics which prevailed in his election is indefensible from the standpoint of law or of morals.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is admirable in the trait that he is most loyal to his friends and that he is the last to forsake a cause. We once saw him stand by another. His name was Goldstein. And when the shroud that enwrapped Goldstein became too gold stained for even Lowden, whose agents had performed the operation, it was not so with the Senator. Aye, even after Goldstein had served notice upon those who sought to honor him that he would not accept the nomination, the distinguished Senator from Missouri stood adamant—defiant to the end. When others see that it is wise "to get out and from under," the Senator from Missouri remains constant and firm. His speech to-day is in keeping with his past record.

But I suppose the distinguished Senator from Missouri is about the only Senator who voted to seat Senator Newberry who feels a pang of sorrow over his resignation. Newberryism, which the people have come to understand to mean "the plundering of the people through the purchase of power," will not down. Like Banquo's ghost it will rise again, and it will haunt in future campaigns, as it has haunted in the last campaign, Senators who condemned by their votes the confession of an expenditure of the \$195,000 for his election in Michigan and at the same time said, "We are going to seat you here. We want you to be one of us."

When the Senator casts his watchful eyes over the States that held senatorial elections on November 7 he will see that only two Senators who voted to seat Senator Newberry in the face of the facts, and who came up for reelection at that time, were returned. And both those by tremendously reduced majorities—majorities that permitted them only to squeeze in. All others who went before the people in that campaign and were compelled to answer the issue of Newberryism were swept from power. Their defeats answer the arguments of the Senator from Missouri better than any feeble expression that I might now utter. The people's wishes will prevail, and they have in this instance triumphed.

I am not going to be unkind by mentioning friends and distinguished colleagues who were dashed upon the sands of defeat in the recent storm because of the votes they cast for Newberry. Those who voted for him, and who have not yet gone before their constituents, can make two years from now further apologies for those votes. If the Senator from Missouri, and others of his way of thinking, desire to keep the issue alive, then well and good; but this fact we know from the expressions voiced by him to-day—that the resignation of Newberry was not written with a Spencerian pen.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, has the Senator from Mississippi forgotten that the two Senators who were most strong in their opposition to Senator Newberry—the one who led the attack, and one who ably seconded it—were themselves defeated at the polls? I refer to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. If anything is to be deduced from the voice of the people along the line on November 7 last, of which the Senator from Mississippi has spoken, he will not forget the State of Ohio or the State of Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know whether the Senator spoke in Ohio or in Nebraska or not. Looking at the results of the election, I presume he did; but may I ask the Senator whether he ever heard, in a single speech made by anyone who was opposing the reelection of Senator POMERENE in Ohio or Senator HITCHCOCK in Nebraska, criticism of the position they took with reference to unseating Newberry? The Senator's silence

indicates he did not, and consequently there was no such issue there.

Mr. SPENCER. I was not in either of those States, and I certainly did not.

Mr. HARRISON. And the Senator never heard of it; did he?

Mr. SPENCER. That does not establish whether it happened or not.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, before moving to adjourn I wish to state that to-morrow I am going to ask the Senate to take up the unfinished business, House Joint Resolution 270, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a credit with the United States for the Government of Liberia, and try to pass it to-morrow.

I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, November 23, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, November 22, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read from the New York Times of yesterday the statement which I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Governor Parker, referring to newspaper interview by Representative ASWELL, yesterday replied briefly but emphatically to Mr. ASWELL, saying:

"His statement is deliberately untrue. His district is one of the recognized heads of the Ku-Klux Klan in Louisiana."

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I ask that the reading clerk read the assault upon the State of Louisiana published in the Sunday morning Washington Post.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, November 19, 1922.]

KU-KLUX KLAN RULES LOUISIANA, GOVERNOR ASSERTS; TO ASK PRESIDENT TO ACT; STATE OFFICERS POWERLESS—ON HIS WAY HERE TO INVOKE FEDERAL MARTIAL LAW TO RESCUE HIS STATE FROM DOMINATION BY THIS SECRET AND ALL-POWERFUL ORGANIZATION—COURTS OF THE STATE CEASE TO FUNCTION AND CITIZENS ARE IN TERROR—ATTORNEY GENERAL COMES WITH GOVERNOR TO ASK CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO TAKE CONTROL—PEOPLE AFRAID TO DISCUSS SITUATION—PRESS IS SILENCED—OUTRAGES AGAINST PERSONS FREQUENT AND NEVER PUNISHED—STATE IN CHAINS OF AN INVISIBLE POWER—SIMILAR CONDITIONS REPORTED IN COMMUNITIES OF OTHER STATES.

SECTION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION UNDER WHICH ACTION IS PROPOSED.

ART. IV, SEC. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence.

[By George Rothwell Brown.]

(Special dispatch to the Washington Post.)

(Copyright by the Washington Post.)

BATON ROUGE, LA., Nov. 18.—The Ku-Klux Klan has reached out boldly for civil power over officers of law and justice over an immense territory and has virtually reduced the sovereign State of Louisiana to the vassalage of the invisible empire.

The machinery of State government has almost ceased to function as the unseen power of the mysterious secret society exerts its force in the offices of State and local authorities and in the very courts of law.

Gov. John M. Parker has gone to Washington to lay the whole situation before President Harding, to inform the Federal authorities that State law has virtually come to a stop in Louisiana in the face of the mysterious power of the klan, and to ask the United States Government to take over the administration of the law in Louisiana or in certain specified portions of the State.

NO PRECEDENT IN 50 YEARS.

The governor's conference with the President on Monday will disclose to the country one of the most amazing and humiliating catastrophes in the whole history of American Government. Not since

reconstruction times, at least, has any governor of a State laid bare to the Nation the fact that a secret power in that State has usurped the functions of government and brought the administration of the laws to a stop.

The Governor of Louisiana to-day is virtually helpless in the face of the power of the most gigantic secret organization which has ever reared its head in America.

GREAT SECRECY PRESERVED.

Not only has it become impossible for the State authorities to cope with the unseen power of the new Ku-Klux Klan, reared upon the ashes of that institution born of a highly emotionalized chivalry which saved white supremacy throughout the South in the "carpetbag" days which followed the close of the Civil War, but it is almost impossible to detect the presence of the vast invisible empire which apparently covers Louisiana, and has extended its way to adjacent States, where there is reason to believe conditions almost as bad as those in this State now prevail. Certain counties in Texas are reported through confidential "grapevine" channels to be in the grip of the invisible empire which has reared itself above the constitutional law of the State and dictates the administration of justice behind an impenetrable veil of mystery and intimidation.

WANTS THE STATE TAKEN OVER.

Governor Parker will appeal to the Federal Government to go into the State of Louisiana and take over the administration of government in the face of the complete paralysis of the local government, under an impelling constitutional mandate, which will leave the Federal Government no alternative but to act with promptness and vigor if the facts to be disclosed at the Washington conference on Monday justify that drastic course. That these facts will lead to the protection of the State government in Louisiana by the Federal authorities is a widely entertained opinion here in Louisiana, where the conditions which the governor will lay bare are as yet merely the subject of whispered confidences among trusted friends.

ORDERS SILENTLY CARRIED OUT.

The power of the "invisible empire" has settled like a shadow upon the State, and men scarcely dare to breathe what little they know of the inner secrets of the great secret society whose unuttered orders are silently and mysteriously carried out by invisible agencies which are superior to the constituted and elected law officers of the Commonwealth.

There is among men in this part of the South whispered speculation as to what course of action the Federal Government will pursue. The state of affairs to be disclosed by Governor Parker is so out of the whole ordinary experience of Americans as to be fairly stupefying. The very courts of justice are paralyzed.

STATE GOVERNMENT DEFIED.

Governor Parker will disclose that the State authorities have now become powerless to cope with the situation. His administration can not move hand or foot to enforce the laws, the administration of which in certain parts of the State has passed into the keeping of a secret government superior to the State, which sets the State itself at defiance.

Not only has the invisible empire usurped the functions of government but at every turn are disclosed evidences that in many instances the sworn officials of the State are themselves members of the Ku-Klux Klan.

The powers of the Federal Government which Governor Parker will seek to invoke are embodied in section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature or of the executive—when the legislature can not be convened—against domestic violence."

MURDERS AND OTHER VIOLENCE.

The extent of "domestic violence" in Louisiana under the State-wide sway of the invisible empire of the Ku-Klux Klan may be disclosed in the confidential communication to be made by Governor Parker and by the attorney general of the State, who has accompanied him to Washington. It has been reported that there have been a great many murders and other acts which, without a full possession of all the facts, would be classified as outrages against citizens.

It is a significant fact, however—and this must be borne in mind—that there is every evidence that the klan enjoys the support and confidence of thousands of the best and most law-abiding citizens of the State. The very scope which the secret society has attained bears testimony to this fact.

CLAIMS ON BEHALF OF KLAN.

It is claimed on behalf of the Klan that it stands for the maintenance of law and order and of Anglo-Saxon supremacy; that its actions setting at naught the law itself have been dictated by the highest feelings of patriotism; that it has punished the lawbreaker and the violator of the sanctity of the home; that it has driven from the community the worthless and the degenerate elements. Thus the system has its defenders, and has been able to extend its sway with such absolutism as to choke off and stifle the machinery of the law which stands in the way of the exercise of its will.

TERRIFYING TO THE LAWLESS.

The mystery which envelops the whole institution of invisible government constitutes one of its most baffling characteristics. Nobody knows who belongs to the klan; nobody knows when or where it will next strike. Its aspects as a supergovernment, taking the administration of the law out of the constitutionally constituted officials of the law and administering justice according to its own conception of what constitutes civil and social justice, render it peculiarly terrifying to the lawless and those who have fallen within whatever limits of ban may have been imposed by the secret objects of the society.

A man is seated in his office, and a stranger enters and asks for a confidential conference. A few minutes later that man is at the railroad office buying a ticket.

"Where to?" asks the agent.

MEN "JUST VANISH."

"It makes no difference, any place," is the answer. The man vanishes. The community knows him no more. There is whispered discussion and then the subject is dropped. The same thing happens again and again. Men mysteriously drop out of their accustomed haunts. Neighborhoods are suddenly relieved of the occasional individual long regarded with suspicion. A man who has been living with

a low-caste woman, in violation of the moral code, bringing scandal to a community, suddenly decides to leave. Nobody knows why. He simply leaves and is heard of no more.

SIMILAR CONDITIONS ELSEWHERE.

From other States have gone to Washington reports of similar conditions in other communities. Evidence has been presented that the Klan has permeated the whole fabric of official life, that its members are themselves the officials charged with the enforcement of the law, and that the law is administered not according to the law of the State but according to the law of the invisible power lodged in what is known in popular parlance as the Ku-Klux Klan. Nobody really knows whether in fact this is the true name of the society.

In Louisiana conditions are said to be worse in Morehouse Parish, in the northern part of the State.

ASWELL'S REPLY.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, the scurrilous story just read by the Clerk from the Washington Post of Sunday, seriously reflecting upon the officers of the law and the people of the State of Louisiana, is false and infamous.

In my opinion it is entirely proper for the attorney general of a State to come to Washington to seek advice and assistance from the Department of Justice on any question of law enforcement, but it is quite another matter for the Governor of Louisiana to create a nation-wide sensation and inflict irreparable injury upon his State. Then, too, the governor's noisy methods do not capture criminals.

I propose calmly and without passion to present the simple record of fact in this case, which record to any fair-minded person reveals two facts:

1. That the story is utterly false and without justification or foundation of fact.

2. That to the humiliation and regret of all our people the Governor of Louisiana with his insatiable thirst for publicity is responsible for the grave injury done our State.

What should be done with a governor who for personal or political preferment would sacrifice or assassinate the fair name of his own State is a question to be settled by the people of Louisiana.

Nailing this libel of the law-abiding and patriotic people of my district and State, I present a copy of my telegram to each sheriff and judge in the eight parishes of my congressional district, located in the geographical center of the State, and responses from the law officers and citizens of every parish in the district. These telegrams come from Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, telling one and the same story which means that the evidence I present is irrefutable.

I ask the reading clerk to read these telegrams in order that the Members may hear the refutation.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1922.

Morning press here publish sensational story that Governor Parker, en route to Washington to invoke Federal martial law in Louisiana, to have Federal Government take control of our State government; that murders and outrages against citizens are frequent, State wide, and unpunished by local officers of the law, and that State and local government has ceased to function, with citizens in terror. Please wire me fully night letter exact situation in your parish. I believe these charges against our people are false and infamous, but I need official statement from you before matter comes up for action to-morrow forenoon.

J. B. ASWELL.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 19, 1922.

Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram this date giving press reports at Washington, D. C., casting malicious slander on the State of Louisiana received. Such reports are absolutely false in truth and fact. The parish of Rapides, the third largest in the State, has never enjoyed a more peaceful epoch and a more universal observance of the law. This same condition prevails over the entire State of Louisiana. I have personally had occasion to visit various parishes in this State, from the State line of Arkansas to the Gulf of Mexico, in the past 10 days, and I can truthfully say that the citizenship of the State is with its peace officers for a full observance of all its laws, and I brand all reports or rumors for the necessity of Federal interference or martial law as absolutely unnecessary and without foundation or reason, and as being a most willful and malicious slander upon the fair name of this great State.

F. E. DAVID,

Sheriff Rapides Parish, La.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman JAMES B. ASWELL,
Eighth Louisiana district, Washington, D. C.:

Your wire to Sheriff David read. As a native-born voting taxpayer of our beloved Louisiana, I brand Governor Parker's statements to the press concerning conditions existing in this State as malicious misrepresentations and utterly devoid of facts. Rather significant Governor Parker failed or refused to publish in Louisiana newspapers his intended visit to Washington or its purposes. Maybe his train company en route there affected his mental equilibrium, if such he has ever been possessed of. Am sure that majority wishes of Louisianians would be his commitment to sanitarium for treatment of mental derangements, preferably outside of Louisiana.

W. CANNON FLOURNOY.

COLFAX, LA., November 19, 1922.

Hon. J. B. ASWELL, M. C.

Washington, D. C.:

Violation of law less frequent than at any time in 20 years. Peace and harmony prevail except in very few cases of moonshiners. Press reports mentioned in your telegram false and infamous. Absolutely no foundation for any such expression.

J. W. DUNCAN.

MANY, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

No more lawlessness in this parish or district than ordinarily, and courts are functioning properly.

J. H. BOONE, District Judge.
J. B. HILL, District Attorney.

WINNFIELD, LA., November 20, 1922.

J. B. ASWELL,

Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Governor Parker may need United States troops in Baton Rouge, but we don't need them in Winn Parish. The reports are absolutely unfounded, and so far as this parish is concerned conditions were never better. Recently Governor Parker told one of our citizens that this part of the State had given him no trouble.

R. W. OGLESBY, Judge.
W. T. HEFLIN, Sheriff.
A. W. RADESCICH, Representative.

MANY, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

You can not denounce too strongly as absolutely false and uncalled for report that the crime and disorder are frequent or beyond control of officers. Every person accused of serious crime in Sabine Parish within the past 12 months has either been tried or is under arrest awaiting trial. The courts are doing their duty, and we are only bothered with petty offenses, such as bootlegging. Martial law would be a disgrace and a travesty on justice.

J. D. DABBY,
Sheriff Sabine Parish.

NATCHITOCHES, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman JAMES B. ASWELL,
Care House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Conditions in Natchitoches Parish and bordering parishes are very quiet. Very few violations of law; no mobs, no one fears for life or property; people harmonizing and are generally settling down to business. I can not conceive anyone making such rash, false, slanderous statements against Louisiana's good people. North and central Louisiana are in perfect order. Some one must have had a nightmare.

J. W. PAYNE,
Sheriff Natchitoches Parish, La.

NATCHITOCHES, LA., November 20, 1922.

Hon. J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

Any reports that outrages and murders against citizens are being committed or that law violators are going unpunished by officers throughout this State are false and untrue. Local government and citizens of my district cooperating. No terror among people. Conditions among citizens, law-abiding and quiet. Glad to refute such slanderous statements.

JAS. W. JONES, Jr.,
Judge Eleventh District Court of Louisiana.

COLFAX, LA., November 20, 1922.

Hon. J. B. ASWELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Conditions in my parish for peace and quiet excellent. Could not be better under circumstances. No unrest among the citizens; only minor violations of the law, mostly caused by the whiskey element. As for the need of martial law, such an idea is ridiculous, false, and infamous and without foundation. Such propaganda could only come from a revengeful mind to satisfy personal grudge. Officially I am in touch with the sheriffs throughout the State, being located in the center, thus know conditions generally to be excellent.

It is only the wicked who are peeved and looking for refuge under the guise of the Government.

I am exceedingly grieved to know our great State and its good people are being wrongfully accused.

L. O. CLINTON,
Sheriff Grant Parish, La.

LEESVILLE, LA., November 19, 1922.

Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Law and order prevail in Vernon Parish. Local officers performing duties. No disorders here and anticipate none; rumors to contrary absolutely false.

D. F. TURNER, Sheriff.

JENA, LA., November 19, 1922.

Hon. J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

In reply to your telegram, beg to advise that the statement referred to in Washington press as to willful violations of the law and that officers do not put forth every effort to enforce the law are absolutely false and there are not grounds for such statement. We have some minor violations of law, such as violating the Volstead Act and Hood bill. The conditions of our parish for the past three or four years have greatly improved as to respect of our State laws. We do know that our officers and citizens do not deserve any such unjust criticism. Our citizens and officers, with respect to the enforcement of law, will compare favorably with any parish or county in the United States. Your telegram is our first intimation of such complaint. From Governor Parker's speeches and newspaper clippings in Louisiana we note that most service complaints are against the Klan known as Ku-Klux

Klan. If there is any such organization in La Salle Parish, we have no knowledge of it, and there has been no violations that have been attributed to the Klan. We assure you that we stand for enforcement of law and we do not need any Federal aid.

J. B. PEYTON, Sheriff.
F. E. JONES, Judge District Court.

MANY, LA., November 20, 1922.

J. B. ASWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana papers carry nothing about matter in message; think there must be some mistake made by newspaper. Everything quiet and orderly here.

W. H. VANDEGAER.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 19, 1922.

J. B. ASWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Press comment is false; we have the most prosperous and peaceful country in the United States; less crime committed in Louisiana than any other State in the United States.

JONAS ROSENTHAL.

MARKSVILLE, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram a great surprise; nothing of the kind exists or ever thought of. This part of the State as peaceful and law-abiding as ever in its history.

AMET GUILLOT, Sheriff.

MARKSVILLE, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman J. B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

Peace and quiet never more supreme, as at present no such conditions exist as referred to in your message.

S. ALLEN BORDELON, Judge.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 20, 1922.

Congressman JAMES B. ASWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire to Sheriff David read. The complained of conditions in this State and its parishes attributed to Governor Parker through daily press is purely imaginary on his part. I have lived in this State practically all my life and have never known conditions any more peaceful or orderly than at present.

SWORDS R. LEE.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 19, 1922.

Hon. J. B. ASWELL, Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Telegram to sheriff received. I wish to brand such charges as malicious unqualified lies. If press report true, I am sure Governor Parker has been misled by some false, malicious, cowardly friends possessed of solely mercenary motives. If such be the governor's attitude would recommend he be sent to Surgeon General for S. C. D.

MARVIN CAPELL, M. D.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., November 20, 1922.

JAMES B. ASWELL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire date; have conferred with sheriff and others. Rumors absolutely without foundation; law and order never was better observed in Rapides than to-day. Surprised, and news came like thunderbolt. Must be malicious statements from unreliable source. Our officers competent and doing their duty. No more peaceful community in the United States than this. You can most emphatically deny any allegation of need of martial law here. We resent any such statement being made and desire to know names of parties circulating such reports.

A. T. FELT,
General Secretary Alexandria Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. ASWELL. Gentlemen, these convincing telegrams from every parish in my congressional district should remove the stain from the fair name of our State, reveal the fine spirit of our people, and impress upon the country the magnitude of the crime committed against a State blessed not only with patriotic and progressive people but rich in natural location and varied resources little known to the world. [Applause.]

Louisiana contains 45,996 square miles of land and 2,328 square miles of landlocked bays, lagoons, and rivers.

Louisiana soils are divided into alluvial lands, sea or coast marsh, redeemable by levees and drainage, bluff land, prairies, long-leaf pines, hill lands, and oak lands.

Louisiana is composed of 28,000,000 acres of land, of which only about 5,500,000 are cultivated, and on these there are yearly produced crops valued at \$350,000,000.

Louisiana's climate is admirable—breezy and cool in summer, mild in winter, healthful at all times. The State is not subject to extremes of heat in summer or of cold in the winter.

Louisiana's products are varied and abundant. Sugar, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, oats, wheat, sorghum, jute, hemp, ramie, grasses, clovers, and forage crops; millet, potatoes, vegetables, oranges, lemons, mandarins, olives, figs, and grapes are produced with great profit and little labor.

Louisiana's live stock consists of sheep, horses, hogs, cattle, and mules. Her pastures are inviting, her waters are pure and refreshing, and her canebrakes in winter offer protection and forage.

Louisiana's railway system traverses 7,780 miles.

Louisiana leads all other States this year in highway construction.

Louisiana has more navigable rivers and a greater length of navigable waterways than any other State.

Louisiana's rivers, bayous, and lakes are mostly navigable and many run north and south through the entire State. They furnish transportation facilities for many commodities and create competition in rates. They furnish water for irrigation, are deep, running streams which abound in fish and furnish cool water for stock.

Every parish except four can be reached by navigable streams at some period during the year.

Louisiana produces one-half million bales of cotton annually.

Louisiana produces 95 per cent of all the cane sugar raised in the United States.

Louisiana grows more rice than any other State in the Union.

The strawberry and vegetable crops of Louisiana amount to more than \$5,000,000 annually.

Louisiana's fishing grounds and oyster beds are famous and abundant and furnish the most delicious of these luxuries in the world.

Louisiana is the coming seat of the oyster industry of the United States. Her tidal bottoms, the home of the oyster, embrace 4,500,000 acres, a greater area of oyster waters than have Maryland and Virginia combined.

Louisiana's forests are magnificent and the varieties of her timbers numerous. They consist of oaks, hickories, ash, elms, gums, magnolias, pines, maples, cypress, and a quantity of others.

Louisiana is the first State in the Union in lumber production.

Louisiana's fuel-oil and natural-gas fields are unsurpassed in the United States. Some of her oil wells have a record of 3,000,000 barrels of oil each.

Louisiana has the greatest deposit of pure rock salt in the Western Hemisphere. It comes up to 99 per cent pure.

Louisiana's educational facilities are splendid. Every parish is well provided with public schools for both white people and negroes.

Louisiana's private universities, colleges, and schools are of high order.

Louisiana's State university and agricultural and mechanical college is an up-to-date institution, and within a few years will be entirely rebuilt.

Louisiana's normal college at Natchitoches is a splendid training school, offering great advantages in scholarly education.

Louisiana's polytechnic schools at Ruston and Lafayette are well equipped.

Louisiana's Southern University, a State school for negroes, is equal to any in the South.

Louisiana has a splendid deaf and dumb institute, a new institute for the blind, two charity hospitals, a soldiers' home, large and commodious buildings for the infirm, and an institution for the negro blind.

Louisiana has four State agricultural experiment stations—at New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Calhoun, and Crowley.

Health conditions in Louisiana are good. The death rate is far below that in many States in the Union.

Louisiana's towns and cities are progressive, thriving, businesslike, and anxious to welcome people from other sections.

Louisiana's people are law-abiding, liberty-loving, and God-fearing—red-blooded patriotic Americans.

Louisiana's wealth of sunshine and climate; her treasures of natural resources boundless and as yet untold; her minerals, forests, and fertile soils; her 7,000,000 acres of unoccupied cut-over lands; the world-famed hospitality of her citizens, all offer unexcelled opportunities for worthy people from other States to come among us, become citizens, and enjoy with us the astounding riches and opportunities of our State. Her population numbers less than 2,000,000, while there is room for 10,000,000 happy and prosperous people. We have extended a hearty welcome to all the worthy who choose to live among us. We love our country and, like Abou Ben Adhem, we love our fellowman. [Applause.]

The tide has turned to Louisiana. The cry throughout the land to-day is not "Young man, go West," but "Young man, go South," to Louisiana. Our people with open hearts and earnest purpose are eagerly inviting capital to be invested in our rare industrial and financial opportunities.

What a cruel blow below the belt industrially and financially to our hopes and purposes! How costly and difficult the regaining of former prestige! The impression by the publication

of vile and groundless stories sent broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the land has placed in the public mind the belief that lawlessness, crime, murder, and bloodshed are rampant in the State of Louisiana. A dagger has been thrust into the heart of our people and unless withdrawn now the wound will be bleeding for years to come. The injury done to our State and people is appalling. We are charged with being a people more lawless than the Mexicans ever were and whose State government is more puny and feeble than that of Russia, but when the record is given in detail, thank God, the clouds will pass away and the sunshine of promise will burst upon us again with the country seeing Louisiana still marching forward in peace, in progress, in contentment, and in purpose equal to that of any other State. Like a rare gem in the crown forming the States of the Union, Louisiana will continue to radiate the glory of her proud people in their natural wealth and in their religious freedom and political independence. [Applause.]

The Governor of Louisiana now denies responsibility for the whole matter, but, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is interesting to note that the sensational story was released in Baton Rouge Saturday night for the Sunday papers, as the governor dramatically left for Washington and gave out interviews along the way. Finding no committee, brass band, or banners to receive him at the station here, receiving scant encouragement from any Member of Congress, and meeting at the White House the big-hearted, personally lovable President, who cordially greeted him as he greets all his fellow citizens, the governor found a chilly reception when he asked for Federal interference in a sovereign State. [Applause.]

The governor then undertook to "kiss himself out" of the embarrassing situation by declaring he had not come to seek Federal interference and denying all responsibility for the murderous assaults upon the State of Louisiana in a letter to the Washington Post as follows:

Never since I have been reading newspapers have I known a writer to build such a fanciful superstructure on such a slight foundation of fact as has been done by George Rothwell Brown, of your staff, in the article sent you from Baton Rouge and printed with such display in your issue of Sunday. The article is a slander on Louisiana and on its chief executive.

I did not see your correspondent and he made no application for an interview. Most of his statements could have been disproven had he made even the most superficial investigation. To state that the klan "has reduced the sovereign State of Louisiana to the vassalage of the invisible empire" is one of the most extravagantly inaccurate observations I have ever known a newspaper man to make, and it is the more inexcusable because the man was on the ground. There is absolutely nothing on which he could have based his statement that "the machinery of State government has almost ceased to function."

There never has been the most remote idea on the part of anyone in Louisiana of appealing to the Federal Government "to go into the State of Louisiana and take over the administration of government."

I will not take the time to deny each of the many misstatements in your article, but can say it is 90 per cent inaccurate and conveys a totally wrong impression. The damage done by this article and the importance given it by the display with which you presented it will be made the subject of conference on my return to Louisiana, at which time it will be decided as to the further action that will be taken.

Masked men and invisible empires have no place in America, and I have denounced the Ku-Klux Klan as vigorously as I know how in its own stronghold. We have only begun to fight this movement, which strikes at fundamentals of orderly government. We will be able to rid Louisiana of this vicious development the more quickly if we can have the help of other States and of the Federal Government. We can deal effectively with our local situation if it can be cut off from the support and encouragement it is receiving from the outside. I have sought cooperation in an effort to meet the situation in the most immediate way, and to free the people of some of our communities from the terrorism in which they now are held. Since the klan does not work in the open, I may say that the problem presented is largely an investigational one.

You will note that in one paragraph he denies and in another he admits, then he denies and again he admits.

The governor says 10 per cent of the Post story is true. Let him tell the world who gave Brown that 10 per cent.

In his dilemma, as he denies he ever sought Federal control of Louisiana, the governor evidently forgot that on October 30, 1922, discussing the disappearance of a man in Morehouse Parish, La., as a result, citizens who reside there say, of a neighborhood feud which had existed for many years, in a letter to Mr. Joseph Morningstar, 650 West Thirty-fourth Street, New York City, the governor said:

It will be necessary to use all the influence at your command to get the United States Government to take an interest in this matter, and for that reason I would appreciate your writing me at length your opinion of this man as a soldier, and put it in such shape that I can send it to Washington with the certainty that it will bring results. If these results do not come quickly, could I impose upon you by asking you to get in touch with all your Congressmen and Senators, requesting that they take the matter up with the Department of Justice to see that not only is this matter probed to the bottom but that the murderers are brought before the bar of justice?

In sending Governor Parker's letter to Senator WALSH of Massachusetts on November 9, 1922, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, Mr. Morningstar, of New York

City, in an appeal to Senator WALSH to get Federal action in the Louisiana case, said:

Where the governor of a State admits that justice can not be secured through local authority it seems obvious that the Federal authorities gain jurisdiction, and the copy of the letter of Governor Parker clearly puts this case in that category.

Do these letters not prove that Governor Parker for many weeks has been trying to invoke Federal usurpation of the government of a sovereign State?

The President, of course, denied him Federal interference in Louisiana. Then, after repeated denials and admissions of his purpose in coming to Washington, the governor took a parting shot at the Louisiana situation in the afternoon papers of yesterday:

A man is a damnable coward to attach himself to such an organization and remain within it as one of its active forces. It is now my solemn duty to whip them. Louisiana will soon see a fight to the finish. The best people of the State are behind me, and I know I will win.

If we could have some help from the several States and from the Federal Government the matter of delving to the bottom of the rotten mess would be made easier.

I know nothing of the Ku-Klux Klan in Louisiana except from statements in the press, generally resulting from the governor's public threats, bluff, and bluster. With the exception of Mr. Simmons, of Atlanta, who appeared here in a public hearing, I have never to my personal knowledge seen a klansman. I was in every parish in my district in the summer and no one discussed the Ku-Klux Klan with me or sought in any way to connect me with the Klan or with its enemies. I am therefore free to defend the people of my district and State without reference to any fraternal or religious organization.

I am 100 per cent Louisianian and I resent the attempt to surrender the sovereignty of my State to Federal authority. [Great applause.] I resent the unwarranted and libelous assaults upon the law-abiding people of Louisiana. I gladly defend all the people of my State against such injustice. If these villainous published attacks as the record indicates were caused by assertions of the Governor of Louisiana, he presents a humiliating and pathetic spectacle playing cheap politics at the expense of our State to gain front-page notoriety. He may perhaps have his eye on our senior Senator's seat, or on the office of Vice President with the Progressive Republicans in 1924, who announce a meeting here early in December to take over the present Republican Party, now about to go into political bankruptcy, write its platform, and name its candidates. What difference to him whether Democratic Senator or Republican Vice President? Judging from the thrilling story sent out from Baton Rouge, the governor came, waved the red flag against the people of his State, and got publicity ahead of the Progressive show, perhaps to attract their attention. But I denounce in unmeasured terms the attacks upon the good name, the honor, the integrity, and the patriotic devotion of the law-abiding people of the great sovereign State of Louisiana, a people whose high regard for law and order, whose civic pride, whose moral integrity, whose ready obedience to law, whose unselfish devotion to State and country, whose fine Americanism are surpassed by none in this or any other land. [Applause.]

If the Governor of Louisiana finds himself helpless, if there is a crisis in Louisiana, a riot, an uprising, or public emergency, why has he not called out the State militia or assembled the Louisiana Legislature, instead of damning our State with a demagogic public appeal for Federal aid from a Republican national administration?

Upon what ground can Federal law be invoked in the Louisiana case? Why has not the Governor of New Jersey appealed for Federal aid in the Hall-Mills case? Establish this precedent, and should a southern darkey steal a chicken and the local authorities fail to catch him, Federal officers could be sent into the State to track him down and punish him for stealing the fowl. This proposal is too preposterous and absurd to be discussed among intelligent men. [Applause.]

It is inconceivable, it is monstrous that after 50 years of peace and patriotic devotion of the southern people to the flag of our country the governor of any State, North or South, should seek again to bring the damnable disaster of even a semblance of carpet-bag rule upon any sovereign State. I care not what others may do, but I for one will go to any humanly possible limit to prevent the enactment of this crime against my State, against a people so proud, so loyal, and so devoted to our country and her institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] for a moment? There are two gentlemen from Louisiana who desire about 10 minutes each to speak somewhat along the same lines as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has just spoken.

Mr. MONDELL. How many?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Two. Will it be agreeable to the gentleman to let them speak now?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely proper for these gentlemen to be heard.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] may speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] may address the House for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I merely wish to make a short statement expressing in a general way my grievous disappointment and indignation at the great injustice that has been done the people of my State and of my congressional district. It is useless to go into details about this matter. I have no particular criticism to level against anyone, except that which would naturally arise out of a condition of this sort; but as a citizen of Louisiana and as a Member of this House and as a representative of a great congressional district, I feel it is my duty to condemn in unmeasured terms the unwarranted assault upon local authorities and people of Louisiana and to defend them so far as possible against the statement that they are unable to enforce the law in Louisiana and to control their domestic affairs.

Gentlemen, out of all the pitiless publicity that has come to my State, out of all the insinuations that our local government has broken down, that lawlessness is rampant and that life is insecure, what do you find? Going over this entire record you will find presented to the Nation only one law violation in one locality.

I wish to assert here that Louisiana and the people of Louisiana are just as law-abiding as the people in any State of this Union. Probably the biggest question in America today is one of law and order, one of respect for and obedience to the legally constituted authorities. But in each State it is the duty and the province of the citizenship of that State, of the courts of that State, to enforce its own laws and punish those who violate them. I think the action of the President in notifying the people of Louisiana and the authorities in Louisiana that the Federal Government would not interfere because no Federal question was involved was admirable. [Applause.]

Now, in all this publicity and out of all the things appearing in the newspapers throughout the Union, in all the charges against my State as to lawlessness, I say they have only mentioned one crime committed in one locality, and I doubt if any other State could show a record equal to that. Since we have been here we have seen riots in Washington, midnight murders and assassinations. This District is under the jurisdiction of Congress. Why should the State of Louisiana come here for protection? The State of Kansas just now is having trouble similar to that ascribed to the State of Louisiana, but is attending to her own business and not asking any assistance at the hands of the Federal Government.

The parish of Morehouse, in my district, is the particular point under fire. I can say that Morehouse Parish is one of the most progressive and law-abiding parishes in Louisiana, and the town of Mer Rouge, where the crime is alleged to have been committed, is one of the best communities in the State. But if the crime referred to is ever to be ferreted out and punished, it will have to be through the authorities of the State of Louisiana and of the parish of Morehouse.

I want to express my appreciation to the Members of the House for the various assurances they have given that they do not believe the charges made against my State. [Applause.] The people of Louisiana, just as those in other States in the Union, resent any attempt to draw the Federal Government into taking charge of the local affairs and interfering with their local self-government. Every time that experiment has been tried it has resulted disastrously. We know what it means to the citizenship of any State to draw the Federal Government into interference with the local or State government.

Gentlemen, I wish once more to enter my solemn protest against this attempt to get the Federal Government to interfere with the affairs of our State, and to express my indignation on account of the damaging publicity that has been given the affairs of Louisiana through any attempt by officials of Louisiana

or newspapers to destroy her prestige and the good name of her people by the imputation that she is helpless and impotent in any respect.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any evidence anywhere that the governor has asked for Federal interference, except what is in the headlines in the newspapers?

Mr. WILSON. I think there is.

Mr. BUTLER. I have been watching for that and have not seen it.

Mr. WILSON. The governor's statement was that he came to this city for Federal assistance; that is his statement that was printed in the press. These newspaper articles state that the attempt was to be made to have the Federal Government take charge of the affairs in Louisiana, and that the local State government had broken down.

Mr. PARK of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. PARK of Georgia. Did not the letter of the governor, in which he denied the statement in the newspaper, bear out the very statements that the newspaper made?

Mr. WILSON. These letters are in the RECORD and will speak for themselves.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I regret it as exceedingly unfortunate that the time of this body should be taken up by the discussion of matters of this kind. My colleagues from Louisiana have gone somewhat into the details in the discussion of what I believe and know is a base slander against the people of my State. I was much surprised on getting off the train Sunday morning to take up the Washington Post and reading the story which the gentlemen have referred to.

The evil effects of a slander against the character of anyone, when once circulated, can not be entirely eliminated. This is true with reference to a State.

However, I feel that I would not be representing my people did I not do all in my power to refute the effects of an unwarranted, uncalled-for, and vile slander which was contained in the article published in the Washington Post on last Sunday. I will direct my remarks to that part of the article which said—

That the courts of the State cease to function and citizens are in terror.

I have lived in the district which I have the honor to represent all my life. Previous to my service here I was connected with the courts of my State for 16 years in the capacities of prosecuting attorney and district judge.

I have just returned from Louisiana, where I spent two months amongst the people of my district. I personally know the Federal, State, and parish officers; saw and talked to most of them while there, and heard of no trouble of any kind of the nature as outlined in the Post's story.

The reason for the writing of this story I do not know. I can not say whether it was caused to further some one's political ambition or not. The article would indicate that the writer was in touch with the Governor of Louisiana and was representing his views. However, the governor has stated over his signature that he did not see the writer of this article. That is a controversial matter between the Governor of Louisiana and the Washington Post. But what I want the Members of this House to know is that the conditions in Louisiana, as given me by Representatives from other sections, and the conditions in my district as I know them would not justify the slanderous article which was carried in the Post on Sunday.

I know that this article is a gross and unfair misrepresentation of conditions as they really exist in Louisiana, and feel impelled to condemn and denounce it as an unjustifiable slander of our splendid people and the good name of our State. I can not lead myself to believe that the governor and chief law officer of our State could be so misinformed as to the law and the facts as to ask for Federal intervention to supersede and displace the legally constituted authorities of the State of Louisiana and destroy local self-government. I deny that any legal or constitutional authority exists for such a course as pointed out in the Post's story, which quotes section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government and protect each of them against invasion and, on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence.

For this section of the Constitution provides for action by the State legislature, when it could be convened, before any action is authorized by the governor; and yet the Post's article indicates that the governor and attorney general are ignoring this plain provision of the law and are seeking to set up a carpet-bag government in Louisiana without the consent of her people. Through this infamous, uncalled-for, and unwarranted article Louisiana has suffered irreparable injury, her people and authorities placed in a false light before the Nation, as evidenced by expressions from the press and pulpit here in the Capital City; and while I realize the injuries done our State can not be repaired and her loss of prestige fully restored, I feel that I voice the sentiment of her people, irrespective of rank, creed, or individual views with reference to any organization, when I enter my indignant protest and unhesitatingly assert that Louisiana is capable of local self-government and of the administration of her laws and the dispensation of justice through her own chosen officials and tribunals, which are as competent and patriotic as in any other State in the Union.

There are Ku-Klux Klansmen in Louisiana the same as in Washington, New York, Chicago, and Boston. Just why my State should be singled out for such outrageous slander and pitiless publicity is more than I can understand. I have just returned from Louisiana, and know of no conditions to justify in any respect the statements appearing in the press about the Ku-Klux Klan in Louisiana. The courts in Louisiana, Federal and State, are intact and able to function without any interference from the Federal Government. The intimation that the National Government should take charge of the State is an outrageous slander on Louisiana and will be resented by its citizens, irrespective of section or organization, be it secret or open.

We have a man at the head of affairs in this Nation who, I believe, before he will lend his aid to any such drastic action that has been proposed will demand more evidence than a newspaper report or statements from some one with political ambitions.

I am gratified with the expressions of Members of this body, coming from all sections of the country, who have frankly assured the Members from Louisiana that they do not believe these reports that have been carried in the press.

Summing the whole matter up, I say that it is all bunk. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, after what has been said with regard to the great and good State of Louisiana and in her defense, I think it might be well to have the Record record the fact that no one outside of the State of Louisiana, so far as I know, has suggested any extension of Federal control over that great Commonwealth. So far as I am informed, no one in authority in the Federal service, in Washington or elsewhere, has suggested, encouraged, or approved any extension of Federal authority over that Commonwealth. We all wish Louisiana well. We all have very great confidence in her. We approve what her representatives have said in her behalf, and on this side we are just as earnest as they are that Louisiana and all the States shall retain in full force and effect all of their sovereignty and work out their own problems. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its chief clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 361.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES R. CONNELL, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 362.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN I. NOLAN, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3855) to ascertain and settle land claims of persons not Indian within pueblo Indian land, land grants, and reservations in the State of New Mexico.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2212. An act for the future safeguarding of the White House collection of the presidential china; to the Committee on the Library.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10144. An act conveying the peninsula of Presque Isle, Erie, Pa., to the State of Pennsylvania, its original owner, for public park purposes; and

H. R. 367. An act for the relief of J. Irving Brooks.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 446.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering H. R. 12817, a bill to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes. General debate on said bill shall continue until the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union rises on Saturday, November 25, at which time general debate shall terminate. The time for such general debate shall be controlled and divided equally by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries; that on Monday, November 27, the bill shall be taken up for amendment under the five-minute rule; that the consideration of the bill for amendments shall continue not later than the hour of 4 o'clock postmeridian on November 29, at which hour the committee shall rise and report the bill back to the House with such amendments as may have been agreed upon; whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 10, page 1, strike out the words "controlled and" and insert, after the word "equally," the words "between those in favor of and those opposing the bill and shall be controlled."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "member" insert "opposed to the bill."

Line 15, strike out the word "that" and insert the word "than" after the word "later."

After line 6, page 2, add the words "that in consideration of the bill any appropriation made in the bill shall not be subject to a point of order."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, what has the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] suggested in relation to time for the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman from Kansas be willing to have 40 minutes on a side on the resolution? In view of the importance of the legislation to be considered I think there ought to be that much discussion.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think that is a fair suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the discussion of the rule be limited to 40 minutes on a side, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution as amended provides that the shipping bill may be taken up for consideration. It allows three days of general debate, continuing until Saturday of this week, including that legislative day. It also provides for three days' consideration under the five-minute rule for amendment and for a vote upon the bill at 4 o'clock on the 29th day of this month. The rule leaves the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule open to the widest amendment on the floor. Indeed, in order to make it possible that the House itself shall have the greatest opportunity for considering the bill for amendment, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries took the bill into the committee and inserted as a part of the bill many amendments that they had intended offering from the floor. This was done in order to save the time for the Members of the House to offer such amendments as they might deem proper. It is thought that three days devoted to amending the bill will give every Member of the House an opportunity for the presentation and discussion of such amendments as are offered for the purpose of bettering the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the provisions of the rule—I have not read it, but I have been advised as to its provisions and have heard the statement of the gentleman from Kansas—

they are that commencing next Monday morning the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and that the bill shall be voted on not later than Wednesday, the 29th, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is true.

Mr. GARNER. I merely make this suggestion to the gentleman that in case—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, I can not yield for suggestions.

Mr. GARNER. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. In case a respectable minority should undertake to offer amendments, say to the first 30 pages of the bill, they could occupy the three days in the offering of such amendments and there would be no opportunity to offer amendments to the remainder of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If amendments are offered in good faith for the purpose of bettering the bill, they can be discussed and disposed of on the floor in less time than is provided for in the rules. Opportunity to amend the bill is given under the rule. Any effort to filibuster, any effort to delay action, any effort merely to postpone action upon the bill will be thwarted by the rule calling for a vote upon the bill at the time provided.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield further because I have not the time. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, and will ask the gentleman from North Carolina to use his time.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker [applause], of course nothing that anyone could say would change the determination of the majority to put through this rule and probably hereafter to put through this vicious legislation. We can not but record our protest. The legislation proposed is in harmony with the policy of the Republican Party of always providing to give somebody \$10 in order to enable that somebody to give somebody else \$1. This bill is the final milestone in the announced program of the Harding administration in its return to normalcy. The first milestone was the tariff bill—the worst measure of its kind ever enacted by Congress. The second milestone was the so-called antilynching bill, and this is the third milestone. It is well that the administration called this extra session, because in the Congress which will follow this there will be 74 places which are known now by Republicans, but which will know them no more in the succeeding Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this rule does give reasonable debate. The majority of the Committee on Rules, however, at the last minute inserted a provision which makes the appropriations that are provided for in the bill not subject to a point of order. We can only appeal from this day to another future day when the cause of the people will have a better opportunity. The action of the President in forcing this bill is plain defiance of the will of the American people if the recent election means anything. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order a piece of legislation vastly important and quite naturally it will be seriously contested. It is easily understood why that contest is on. I am convinced that the bill opens the way to solve a serious problem, both from a commercial and defensive point of view. I am persuaded that whatever differences there might be in the minds of individual Members as to the proper method of proceeding, to materialize a real necessity, we are generally agreed that the United States ought to become a merchant marine power. There may be those among us who are willing to permanently give up all hope of staying on the sea. I doubt whether there is any great number who are willing to have the country abandon the sea. On the other hand, I think everybody is convinced that it is not a wise economic policy to employ our competitors to carry our overseas trade if it can be done by ourselves. Then, in addition to the economic importance, which is primarily commercial, all Americans can realize the importance of the national-defense element in an American merchant marine. It is needless for me here to comment upon that phase of the problem. Our recent experience makes it unnecessary for further comment. This bill is not the outline of a policy or a declaration of a new purpose of the Government as to whether we are going on the sea or not. We are already on the sea at terrific cost, and the question now before us is rather how are we going to operate our merchant marine; that is, how are we going to profitably run these vessels in the American merchant marine which are now already built? We have now at least 1,500 steel ships, only a small portion of which we are now operating. We must decide upon what we

are to do with them. I am sure we will not scrap them as we did the wooden ships. The country does not want us to convey them to foreign flags and abandon the sea.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I will yield.

Mr. COCKRAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this bill is intended to apply only to ships now in existence and not to apply to ships to be built or operated in the future?

Mr. FESS. The bill is broader than that. The real significance is, What are we going to do with the 1,500 steel ships, 400 of which are in use and 1,100 of which are tied up to the wharves, and by the nature of the case must be expensive or finally deteriorate? When this bill becomes operative, if there is any lack of any character of ships that ought to be built to fulfill the complement of a necessary merchant fleet, of course under the bill that will be done.

I did not mean to use language in the narrow sense, but I meant to say that the big question with us now is how are we going to stay on the seas, not only employing the 400 vessels already in use but add to the vessels we are already operating those 1,100 others which are tied up at the wharf. What is our alternative? I take it that there is no possibility of operating these vessels under the plan of the subvention theory that was our method prior to the Civil War when we were a debtor nation. The mere fact that we built up a merchant marine at that time in that way is not now an argument that we could do it, because we have become a creditor nation instead of a debtor nation. In this case it will operate against rather than for us. If we employ the preferential tariff where we sell more than we buy, it will operate to our disadvantage. That is perfectly clear, and no one can seriously contend that that method is tenable. That leaves us the choice between Government operation or the plan of this bill. Whether it is better for us to go on with Government operation, which I know is very strongly supported by a great number of people in this country as well as by a great number of representatives in both bodies of Congress, I state to you gentlemen frankly that I am not in favor of that alternative. It would seem to me that our recent experience with Government operation of transportation would be decisive against Government ownership of a merchant marine. [Applause.] I think that the evidence of the inefficiency and the wicked extravagance that we have undergone in only recent times in our experiments in Government control ought for all time to put at rest that particular policy of operation. If you and I live long enough to see an end of its bad results, I shall be surprised. I know how a great number of our people argue in favor of it, conceding its inefficiency and wastefulness. They argue that we should go ahead and suffer the loss, no matter how much, so long as it distributes the cost of operation, because the loss will go to the persons who are operating it—that is, those who are employed in doing it—and we could therefore afford to suffer the loss, because while the public pays it it goes to that part of the public employed in the business. Well, the difficulty about that is that the difference in the cost between our operation and our competitors' operation is most largely the difference that we pay our labor in comparison with what is paid to our competitors' labor.

In Government operation the loss is paid out of the Government Treasury without any degree of efficient service. Political operation, which is tantamount to Government operation, from the nature of the case will sacrifice service for place or position and never look to results because no one is responsible, since no one bears the loss. If the Government does it, no one feels it; then why not distribute the cost to those employed, no matter what the loss may be?

If the difference in cost must be made up, then make it specific. And in reality the subsidy in this bill, if you care to call it so—and I do not run away from the word—in reality the subsidy is a subsidy to American labor. If there was no difference in cost of operation there would be no reason whatever for a subsidy. If we were willing to bring our labor to the basis of the labor of our competitors there would not be any doubt at all about our operating an American merchant marine, whether by Government or private enterprise. [Applause.] But I do not believe that it is the thought of the American Government and the American people to place our labor under the same conditions as that of our competitors, whether on the Atlantic or the Pacific. I do not believe that we are ready to go to the same level of either the scale of pay or the conditions under which they work. It has always been the policy of our Government, and especially when within the control of the Republican Party, to maintain the American scale of wages in order to maintain the American standard of living. With our protective tariff we have suc-

ceeded where our laws operate. Attempting on the sea where our laws can not control, we have been driven off the sea. It is because of our inability to cover the seas with American protective legislation that we ask for this protection of our American merchant marine. We aspire to maintain the higher standards of labor on the sea as we have ever done on the land. But with open competition on the sea we have placed our operations at such a great disadvantage in comparison with the operations of our competitors that we were finally driven almost off the seas.

Members of the House, I stand for the higher standards, and therefore I am not inclined to vote for a modification of the navigation laws looking to a reduction of the standard of American labor. There may be need of some revision in detail, but we will hold to the higher standards. If we do that, and that is a matter of law, then I think this Government—unless we are going to continue the business of Government operation, which to me is unthinkable—this Government must make up the difference between the cost of American ships under American law and the cost of operation of competitor ships under our competitors' laws. That difference will exist and must be made up, whatever be our policy on the seas. That seems to me absolutely certain. In Government operation it will be large and indefinite.

If we are to make up the difference, as I assume we must, then let us make it up specifically. Do not make it indefinite. If it is to be a subsidy to labor, let us not permit it under an extravagant, ineffective operation by the Government, where we suffer greater costs with less results, but let us specify what it is to be in the law and then hold those responsible for the efficiency of it responsible for making it a successful merchant marine. That is what this bill attempts to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the gentleman's contention that the benefits of this subsidy will inure alone to the laboring man involved in this question, and that none of the real profit will go to the operators of the ships?

Mr. FESS. The benefits will primarily be to the laboring men employed. I presume that there would be very little, if any, profit beyond what an operator would have, provided he were free to employ foreign labor under foreign conditions, which we will not permit him to do. Our national defense interest will prevent that practice if nothing else would do it. So far as the profit would go, I say to my good friend from Alabama that if the law would make it free for the American company to employ foreign labor, coolie labor, under the conditions that our competitors would employ them, he would make as much, if not more, profit than under this bill. In fact, we are frequently told that no subsidy is necessary if we would repeal these laws. But we will not agree to that. So far as I am concerned I would never agree to the employment on American ships, which might be needed in time of war, of foreigners who have no attachment to our Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hicks). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield another minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, as I see it, it is a choice either to go off the sea altogether, which to me is unthinkable, or continue Government operation, which I believe almost every Member of this House except those socialistic in belief will admit is inefficient and extravagant, as well as unwise, and I do not think creditable; or else some plan outlined as this bill proposes. For myself I am going to suggest that Government ownership at this time is not to be thought of. I am perfectly willing to go forward on the basis of this bill, and, as has been said before, whatever is to be paid by the Government toward the operation of the ships of an American merchant marine is a profitable business, as I think it will be returned ultimately to the Government. Otherwise I shall be greatly disappointed. [Applause.]

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I regret I can not. My time is up.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, to a stranger to our institutions and indeed to many who are familiar with our institutions it will surely seem very remarkable that an administration which only a few days ago was, if not wholly repudiated, at least wholly discredited should attempt with all the blandishments of Executive power to force through this

Congress a measure to which it is tacitly admitted the great mass of the American people are opposed. And yet in the light of the history of one branch—or shall I say one element—of the Republican Party it is perhaps not strange that with the very death rattle in its throat it runs true to form and seeks to serve in its dying moments special interests and special privilege. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Of course, in a discussion on the rule one can not enter into the merits of the bill. I suppose it will be admitted—aye, claimed—that the President in his address to Congress yesterday presented the arguments in behalf of this measure as strongly as they have ever been presented and as strongly as they will be presented in whatever bodies may discuss it. It seemed to me to be a strong presentation if the premises be admitted, but we deny the premises. It also seemed to me that in some of the comparisons the President was singularly infelicitous. For instance, he compared that which is requested in this bill with the expenditures that have been made for public highways and for rivers and harbors. Surely no one will be deceived by that comparison. Public highways are built for all; rivers and harbors are improved for all commerce. You do not pay the truck man a subsidy for traveling over one of the highways that the Government builds. [Applause.] This is not a proposition for general public interest. This is a proposition for individual benefit at public expense.

It seemed to me also that there must be some doubt as to whether we could rely absolutely upon the assurance—and, of course, I do not mean to discredit the President's word in any way—that in no event would these expenditures exceed \$30,000,000 and yet meet all the necessities that are claimed to exist. If that be true, then it seems to me the administration is driven to the position where it must admit that if now under the system under which these ships are being operated it is costing \$50,000,000, but by turning them over to private ownership they can be operated for \$30,000,000, then it is a tremendous reflection upon the administration of the Shipping Board as it now stands by the appointment of the present administration. [Applause.]

Oh, in very truth, this is the old, old fight. It is proposed to fix here a policy for 10 years, and which in all probability it is hoped means permanency, whereby the old Republican doctrine is to be carried out of taxing one man in order that another may thrive; to legislate in order that one group of men may live on the sweat of the brows of other men. That is the principle which is involved.

If the rule shall pass, of course, there will be more elaborate discussion of the bill in detail. I see no reason why the rule should pass. Some gentlemen who are opposed to the bill have said, "Oh, let us pass the rule and consider the measure." Why is it that we should pass a rule and consider a measure which we know the people do not want, to the exclusion of taking up business which we know the people do want? [Applause.] Why do not gentlemen who have made up their minds to oppose this bill in principle stop it now at the threshold by the defeat of this rule and let us turn to matters of greater moment for which there is a demand and upon which we could all agree substantially?

There are some objections to the rule itself. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in his inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] pointed out one. This has been advertised as a very liberal rule. That will depend altogether. It has been advertised as a rule that does not restrict amendments. That will depend altogether. I do not know how many amendments are to be offered in this bill. It will depend altogether on whether the legitimate amendments have been reached by 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon as to whether it proves liberal.

There is another objection to the rule. That is the last amendment proposed, which makes in order the appropriations carried in the bill. This takes from the Committee on Appropriations the power given to it at the time the Budget was created, and around which in a certain sense the whole Budget system was built. It is proposed now to give to a committee of the House a power which the House itself could not exercise under the general rules.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared here and now, that if our own minds have not prepared us the election has prepared us, to meet this proposition at the threshold and check it at this time by the defeat of this rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee yields back two minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] should endeavor to

get a good deal of satisfaction out of the fact that the American people have not been altogether satisfied, because in 18 months the Republican administration and the Republican Congress were not able to cure all of the evils and all of the ills that eight years of Democratic administration laid upon the country. [Applause.]

I am not at all surprised that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], realizing that one of the greatest scandals associated with the Democratic administration had to do with the building of the merchant fleet, and that one of the most difficult and trying problems laid upon the Republican administration and Congress was that of determining what should be done with the wreck of a merchant fleet the Democratic administration left us, does not now desire to have that question brought up for consideration.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] would prefer to be able to say in the campaign two years from now that the Republican Party and the Republican administration had made no effort whatever to settle what is confessedly and admittedly and beyond all question and peradventure one of the greatest and most trying problems before the people of the Republic. It would be easier for him and his party if at the end of two years they could say, "The Republican Party and the Republican administration were confronted with the question of what should be done to save something out of the enormous expenditure of nearly \$4,000,000,000 made by the Democratic administration for a merchant fleet. The Republican Party has made no effort whatever to settle that great question or to determine whether we are to have a merchant fleet and a shipping policy. The Republican Party has allowed the intolerable conditions which it inherited to continue without making any effort to cure them."

Of course, I realize that the gentlemen on the Democratic side would prefer to be in that position two years from now.

What is the question before us? Is it a question as to whether, lacking an American merchant marine, we shall now proceed to the building up of such a marine and to the establishment of a great shipping policy? That is not the question at all. As was very clearly pointed out by the President of the United States in his address to us yesterday, the question is whether we shall go forward in a constructive way, whether we shall continue a policy of obstruction, or whether we shall enter upon a policy of destruction. Those questions this Congress can not escape. The expenditure was made. The fleet, such as it is, was builded. We have it. It is on our hands. What are we going to do about it? There is some difference of opinion in the country as to what should be done. There can be no difference of opinion among honest men as to the absolute necessity of entering upon a discussion of the question with a view of settling it in the best possible way. Gentlemen may not favor this bill. Gentlemen may find some of its provisions are not satisfactory to them. But gentlemen can not escape—at least gentlemen on the Republican side can not escape—the responsibility of meeting this issue. The conditions demand it. The country expects it. And without regard to what gentlemen's views may be as to the wisdom of the legislation, it seems to me it is the duty of the Congress and of gentlemen on both sides of the House, realizing the situation, to meet the issue squarely and vote for the consideration of the measure.

The gentleman from Tennessee objected because there is a provision in the rule which makes in order an appropriation carried in the bill. I have some doubts as to the wisdom of that appropriation. I am not certain how I shall vote on that question, but I do know that in taking up an important matter of this sort the House should not bind itself in advance. The House should not allow one Member, touching this highly important matter, and in this one particular case, to say that the House, or a majority of it, shall not have an opportunity to modify or change the general rule. The House ought to have that opportunity, and therefore it is wise, it is essential, in the interest of a full and a fair discussion of the legislation, that the House should have an opportunity to determine whether or not that appropriation is justified and shall be approved. In conclusion may I say that without regard to what gentlemen's views may be as to the wisdom of the legislation as a whole or in part, they can not escape, it seems to me, the duty of giving this Congress an opportunity to express its will and judgment touching this highly important matter. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming yields back two minutes. The gentleman from Kansas has 16 minutes remaining and the gentleman from North Carolina 29 minutes.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in making his statement seems to attribute the defeat of his party to the fact that all of the ills of the country were inherited from the Democratic administration which has been out of power for two years. I am very much surprised that the distinguished gentleman should come here at this time after the recent experience and offer that argument, because the same statements were made in every voting precinct in the United States to the American people and they repudiated that doctrine entirely. The party to which the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming belongs has been convicted upon the record that they themselves have made, and as a member of the Democratic Party I am indeed glad that this issue is brought to the attention of the American people at this time. If there is any one issue upon which our party can go to the country it is upon this ship subsidy bill. Of all the bad legislation that has been enacted by the majority party in this Congress, in my humble opinion this is the worst measure of all that they have presented for our consideration. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen of the House, to get down to the merits of the rule and this proposition, I wish to have the record clear, and I state that the members of the Rules Committee on the Democratic side voted solidly against reporting this rule to the House, and I am fully convinced that when the measure itself comes before the House the Democratic Party will be recorded against the passage of the bill. I am delighted to hear that so many Members on the majority side of the House will join us in their protest against this measure. I am not reliably informed as to the situation on the majority side, but I did read a day or two ago in one of the leading Republican papers of the country that after a careful canvass of the House the majority leaders hoped to put the bill through the House by a majority of 25 or 30. You have on this side of the House now something like 169 majority, and if you can not summon more than a measly majority of 25 on that side there must be something radically wrong with the bill. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, one reason why I ask the Members of the House to vote against the adoption of this rule is because the bill that is now before the House is apparently a new bill; at least so I am informed by some members of the committee that reported it. A bill was drawn many months ago and thoroughly discussed in the committee, and was put before the people. Now, as I am informed, even as late as day before yesterday the committee took up the bill, made many important amendments to it, most of them very objectionable, that they were not even discussed in the full committee, and the new bill which this House has not had any chance to study or even read, because the bill was only printed yesterday, comes before the House and we are asked to adopt it under a special rule, a bill that the membership of the committee has not had time to consider. This special rule is for the consideration of a bill which the membership of the House has not had time to consider, and therefore I am opposed to the rule and would like to see it defeated and this matter postponed, so that the membership of the House may have time to give it full consideration.

I can not understand why the majority leaders in this House are so insistent on putting this bill through under a gag rule at this time, or under a special rule, to be polite about it. Why, let me call your attention to the fact that you will have a majority in the next House. You will have a Republican Congress in both branches. The President in the White House is of your political persuasion, and why just a few days after election, in which the people have passed judgment on this measure, do you bring in a special rule here, and why in an extra session of Congress called upon this particular bill to ram it down the throats of the American people when your own party is going to be in power for the next two years? That very procedure in itself would convince me and, I believe, any fair-minded voter or citizen in this country that there is something radically wrong somewhere in this bill that necessitates the calling of an extra session and bringing in a special rule and undertaking to force this bill through the House.

I can not see any necessity for the rule or any necessity for this procedure at this time. If there was to be a change in the administration or in the Congress there would be some justification for your stand; but with your own party in power, I can not see the necessity. Ah, gentlemen, the truth is that the leaders of the majority side know that with a majority of 169 there is such a revolution of sentiment in the Republican Party that you do not dare to submit it to the next Congress, even though you have a majority in that Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My friends, therefore, to keep the record straight, I want to call attention to the fact that the Democratic Party in this House has voted in committee, and I hope

will vote on the floor, against the adoption of the rule, and then let us line up our forces in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one thing in the President's message to the Congress yesterday impressed me very much. He called attention to the deplorable condition of agriculture in the Nation. Nearly one-half of our population are engaged in agriculture. Every well-posted citizen in the United States knows that the farmers of the country under this administration have suffered a deflation of their property to the extent of billions and billions of dollars. The President of the United States in his message yesterday recognized that fact, and said that within a short time—no definite time being stated, but at some time in the future—he proposed to come before the American Congress and make some recommendations in behalf of the American farmers. Let me put this question to you: With the deplorable condition of agriculture, in which nearly one-half of our population is engaged, why does the President come before the Congress, after calling the Congress into extra session, and ask it to pass a bill for a Shipping Trust, which will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars, putting that amount into the pockets of the trust, instead of squarely meeting the situation and coming before the Congress and asking relief for agriculture and the farmers of the Nation? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. President, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under our system of Government the Chief Executive has the power, and one might say the duty, of coming before the Congress and presenting legislation to it for its consideration. During the past eight years, since I have been a Member of this body, the Executive has exercised that function a great many times. I have become more and more convinced that the Chief Executive, who is elected by the people, has the right to have such legislation as he may suggest considered by the Congress. As I say, he is the Executive, he is elected by popular vote, and it is his privilege to present an issue if he desires so to do. I have never felt that any member of the President's party should be bound by the President's expressed views, however, and while I shall vote for the consideration of this bill upon the theory that he has a right to present it to the Congress, I shall oppose its enactment because I do not believe in it, nor do I believe that the people of the country desire its passage.

Mr. JOHN M. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have only a few minutes, but I am glad to grant the gentleman a second or two.

Mr. JOHN M. NELSON. The gentleman is on the committee. In section 403 of the bill I find the following language:

All moneys in the fund are hereby permanently appropriated for the purpose of making such payments and the refunds authorized by subdivision (j) of section 416.

Does this rule safeguard that permanent appropriation?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I shall come to that in a moment, for I expect to discuss it if I have the time. To me the passage of this ship subsidy bill is a revival of the famous cost-plus system originated by Mr. Baker when he was Secretary of War, under which we wasted so much money in the construction of cantonments and in other governmental expenditures. The people of the country do not believe in the revival of the cost-plus system. They have had enough of it.

Of course, we have these ships. It cost the Government \$3,000,000,000 to build them, and they must be operated in some way, either by the Government directly or through a ship subsidy. While in peace time I do not believe in initiating Government operation, yet the fact remains that we have these ships and it is a confession of inability on the part of this Republican administration if we say that the Government can not run those ships, now that we have them. You might just as well say that if the Government had constructed the railroads of the United States we would be compelled to turn them over to some private interest in order to run them at a profit after the Government constructed them. If we continue the policy of passing through the Congress of the United States measures that the people do not want and failing to pass measures that they do want, there will be no Republicans on this side of the House after a while. If we continue with this policy of not giving a bonus to the soldiers of the United States when the overwhelming public sentiment is in favor of it, and giving a bonus to men to run ships when the overwhelming public sentiment is against it, the party can not survive, and I submit to gentlemen on the Republican side of the House that this is the sort of measure that ought to be defeated. [Applause.] That does not mean that we ought not to support the

rule. This is a very liberal rule. This is the kind of legislative issue that Congress ought to meet squarely. This is no gag rule. Any part of this subsidy bill can be voted up or down, in or out, and no Republican need have any doubt that he will have a free and untrammelled vote if this rule be adopted.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHN M. NELSON] brings up the question of the appropriation that is in the bill. If we are going to have a ship subsidy measure, we might just as well appropriate the money now as to put it off and appropriate it year by year for 10 years, as we would have to do. If we are going to have a ship subsidy, if we are going to adopt this cost-plus system and pay somebody a percentage on the money expended by the Government to run these boats, and we are going to have to spend some money, we might just as well do it now for 10 years as to have this question come up here year after year.

Mr. JOHN M. NELSON. The gentleman does not answer the question. I asked whether this rule would protect this appropriation. I want to vote for the rule; I think it is liberal, but I understand a clause has been inserted which now removes the right of a Member to make a point of order against the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In my opinion, the gentleman is wrong about that. The right to make the point of order is lost, but any Member of the House may take the floor and offer an amendment when the measure is under consideration in Committee of the Whole to make an appropriation for one year or to strike out the entire appropriation, so that it would be necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to bring in another bill. The rights of the House are absolutely protected under this rule as it is presented, and I would say that if they had not been protected I am satisfied that the rule could never have been reported from the Committee on Rules. As it is presented, I can see no reason for opposition to the rule by any man who opposes the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. POULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, no doubt Pikes Peak is one of the most prominent elevated points in the country, and from it one can see more United States territory on a clear day than from any other point in the Union. On the way to the summit of Pikes Peak there is what is called the halfway house. I am glad to note the arrival at the halfway house of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and I believe that if he will continue along the line he is now traveling he will reach a point where he can really interpret the sentiments and feelings of the American people.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it has been said that one can tell the same thing so often that finally he comes to believe it is true. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDALL] has been making the same talk here on this floor so often to the effect that the shortcomings of the Republican Party lie in the fact of its inability to correct the shortcomings of the Democratic administration—he has told that so often that in charity I really believe there is some thread of conviction in his heart as to that assumption. Now, he said that the result of the election only proved that the American people had not been satisfied because the Republican Party in 18 months could not have undone all that the Democrats did in eight years. Of course, perhaps the gentleman from Wyoming has rather a more vivid recollection than some of us as to how the American people do regard the record of the Republican administration and a Republican Congress. But the gentleman from Wyoming, as usual, undertakes in his sweeping charge regarding the shipping program to lay all the blame at the feet of the Democratic administration. Why, we remember here when a Republican Congress was elected in 1918—by the way, the Republican Party has had four years to rectify all these assumed evils instead of 18 months—you remember, on the Republican side of the House campaign orators were constantly vocalizing complaints as to the American program of shipbuilding during the war. Charges of graft, waste, crookedness, inefficiency, and all that kind of thing were indulged in on frequent occasions. And so, finally, there was a resolution introduced in this House to appoint a committee of four Republicans and two Democrats who were to undertake to investigate the program of shipbuilding under the Democratic administration. That committee was appointed by the present Speaker of this House.

The chairman of that committee was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the heir apparent to the Speakership. Mr. KELLEY of Michigan was on that committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FOSTER], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY], four Republicans and two Democrats,

and after months of exhaustive hearings here in Washington, hearings in New York, hearings in Philadelphia, after every witness who could be found throughout the country who either knew or was supposed to know or was accused of knowing anything about the shipbuilding program was brought before that committee, and after months of consideration, what did that committee find? I hold in my hand the report of that committee, known as the Walsh investigating committee. I can not read all, of course. But here is a significant clause from the concluding portion of that committee's report. I quote:

Considering the program as a whole (referring to the shipbuilding program under the Democratic administration) the accomplishments in the number of ships constructed, the tonnage secured, and the time within which the ships were completed and delivered, constitute the most remarkable achievement in shipbuilding that the world has ever seen.

[Applause.]

That is the language of the committee whose solemn duty it was to investigate and report upon those conditions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield me one more minute?

Mr. POUL. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That was the conclusion of the committee whose duty it was to report to the House upon that question, and I place that against the belated plaint of the gentleman from Wyoming, who comes now and seeks to justify the difficulties in which the Republican Party finds itself in this charge that has long since been barred by all the rules of political fairness and political justice—I place against that empty charge the report of his own committee which shows the Democratic administration and its record in building the fleet of ships which served the United States and our allies in the war and carried food, munitions, and equipment to Europe for the finest Army that ever gathered under the flag and made possible the triumph of our armies in the tangled forests of the Argonne—this committee said that that program was the greatest triumph of shipbuilding in the history of all the world, and I trust the gentleman from Wyoming and others on that side will not seek to belie the report of their committee by their belated partisan attacks upon a marvelous record. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I should begin perhaps by congratulating the House and the Committee on Rules on the broadening of vision that seems lately to have possessed these lords of the articles. Instead of proposing that a measure of this character shall be passed under limitations which preclude and prohibit amendments from the floor, they are now graciously pleased to accord this body three days of its own time to consider amendments to the pending bill. With respect to the provisions for general debate, I think the rule is reasonable. I have no quarrel with the principle of intrusting a Committee on Rules in a body of this size with power to decide or at least recommend the order in which measures shall be considered from time to time. But I do most strenuously object to the action of the committee in imposing a time limit on the power of the House to consider amendments.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] with considerable courage has announced that he is determined to oppose this bill, yet he supports the rule because he believes that he and every Member who dislikes some of its provisions will have a chance to offer any amendment that he considers necessary. And the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], while not going so far as the gentleman from South Dakota, yet does confess to a qualm of conscience about a certain provision, and intimates that unless opportunity were afforded to quiet his scruples by an appropriate amendment he would not support the rule. What certainty has either one of them that the House will have a chance to consider his amendment? Suppose the amendment is not reached when the time limit has expired. What will then be his remedy?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman evidently misunderstood. I defended the rule. I defended a certain provision of the rule against the attack of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I said that provision of the rule was highly important in order to give the House, rather than one Member of it, an opportunity to determine what the House would do in regard to a certain provision of the bill.

Mr. COCKRAN. How does the gentleman know the House will have that opportunity? Suppose the amendment is not reached. What is the gentleman's remedy then?

Mr. MONDELL. There is only one way by which by any possibility the House should fail to reach the last paragraph of the bill, and that is by a filibuster.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, I want no explanation based on mere assumption.

Mr. MONDELL. A filibuster so objectionable as to prevent progress. But we do not propose to allow that filibuster to be successful.

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman makes a statement which is wholly gratuitous. He assumes the existence of a filibuster. The assumption is wholly unwarranted, extravagant, preposterous. The House can always put an end to a filibuster by passing the previous question. Even in committee it can at any time close debate. What I object to is this, that the Committee on Rules should undertake of itself to determine in advance of any action whatever by the House that it is likely to reach a stage of filibustering after a certain date, while as a matter of fact at that very time it may be considering meritorious amendments. The House itself is not left the power to declare when it has completed legitimate enlightening discussion and when, therefore, it is proper to close debate. Would the gentleman from Wyoming accept such an amendment as this to the rule now proposed, where it now provides that the House shall proceed to vote at a certain time would he object to adding the words "*provided that all amendments then pending, which in the judgment of the Chair are not offered for filibustering purposes, are then disposed of*"? Will the gentleman accept that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It would give altogether too much power to the occupant of the chair.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, well, if this side is willing to trust the occupant of the chair with that power, I think the gentlemen can compose his nerves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As a matter of fact the gentleman from Kansas stated here that this limitation is proposed because in his judgment three days afford all the time that is necessary for disposal of amendments. Who is he to decide that? Is he wiser than the House?

The House will be here always competent to decide that very question. Why should this House, now at the very beginning of these proceedings, without knowing how far amendments that may be offered will be helpful, informing, and meritorious—or the reverse—declare that at a certain hour they shall all be shut out and that the House shall proceed to vote then upon a measure which, according to the gentleman from Wyoming and according to the gentleman from South Dakota, may still be in crying need of amendment?

But, Mr. Speaker, to expect consistency from gentlemen supporting a measure of this kind would be something so extravagant that whoever expresses a hope of it by that fact disqualifies himself from any pretense of capacity to instruct or enlighten his neighbors. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The whole proceeding, the bill itself, the President's speech, the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], are all so self-contradictory, so utterly inconsistent with their own propositions, that they strikingly illustrate the inevitable power of truth to assert itself, even through men and through lips that are bent upon perverting it. There is not a proposition laid down by the President which is not controverted and exploded by the arguments with which he seeks to support it. I have not time to consider them all in detail, but the one which is featured most conspicuously in the newspapers friendly to this proposal will serve to illustrate what I say. I will state it fairly. The President declares that this measure is necessary to save our "genius" for marine transportation. In God's name, if we have genius for marine transportation, for what earthly reason do we want the crutch of a subsidy for it? This measure is intended not to vindicate or to maintain our genius for shipping but to impeach and deny it; to declare that by genius, by commercial skill and ability alone we can not maintain an American mercantile marine, and that our only chance of succeeding in it is to plunge our hands into the Treasury—that is to say, into the pockets of men who are in no way concerned in it, and to withdraw from them the profits of their industry and transfer these profits to an industry that can not maintain itself. That is the necessary effect of this legislation if it pass; no other result can possibly flow from it.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says he is in favor of this measure because if the ships are to be administered by Government agency that would be in effect a direct subsidy to labor, and he wants to give the subsidy in a form where it will first pass through the hands of certain gentlemen who will take care that it all remains in the hands of those who first touch it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why is it that every attempt of the Republican Party to help men who labor begins and ends by enriching somebody else? Was there ever yet a subsidy brought in under Republican auspices to help a struggling, poor, impoverished industry? Every one has been and always will be a grant to some concern already enormously rich. If you want to help an industry that is impoverished and in difficulty, go out and give a subsidy to the farmer for every bushel of wheat he raises. I think such a subsidy would be vicious, but it would be infinitely less vicious than this. It certainly is more important that wheat be produced from the ground than that ships should sail the seas under one flag rather than another. This measure is to preserve the genius of American shipping, according to its authors—to make American shipping live not by virtue of its own merits but by levying on the profits of other industries which support themselves. There is no other way in which subsidies can be paid. Industries can not all be subsidized. If they were, there would be nobody putting anything into the Treasury, but everybody would be drawing moneys out of it. And this manifestly would be impossible. Where a subsidy of any kind is granted it must be drawn from the proceeds of other industries which get no aid and which therefore really succeed through commercial genius alone. So that the effect of this legislation, instead of encouraging the genius for American shipping or "genius" for anything else, is to penalize genius that incapacity may be made profitable. That is your policy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that the question propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] as to why this measure is pressed now answers itself. Why do you press it now, when another Congress has been elected fresh from the people? I will tell you. You press it now because the new Congress is fresh from the people, and for that reason the new Congress would not permit the enactment of such an infamy as this. You are taking advantage of a feature of our Government—a feature that can not well be changed—which keeps a Congress in existence after its successor has been chosen because it is essential chiefly for the purpose of counting the electoral vote; for a body in existence with recognized authority is the only body capable of settling disputes rising out of a contested election. But when a lame-duck Congress is called in extra session to defeat the very purpose for what its successor was chosen, as in this case, then there may not be technical treason against the Constitution, but there is actual revolt against the spirit of our institutions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, a good many people are fond of talking about the results of the late election. I think those gentlemen who have prospects of running for office again will perhaps be more susceptible to the lesson of that election than those upon whom the popular verdict has fallen with heavy, crushing, and final weight. Let me say to them that the verdict of that election is that this country is going to be democratic hereafter in fact as well as in name. [Applause.] And, mind you, I say that with very great deliberation, because I have seen it democratic in name, and with the Democratic Party in power, when it was not democratic in fact. Let me give this warning to both parties. This country has solemnly decided that it must be restored to its democratic foundation. The essence of democracy is contained in a very few words. No man must be permitted to take one dollar and enjoy it that is produced by the labor of others, or be deprived of one dollar that has been produced by his own labor. You can not pass this subsidy without taking the fruits of other men's labor and giving it to this bloated Shipping Trust. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is always entertaining, whether instructive or not. [Applause and laughter.] It is a delight to hear him. The voice and rhetoric of the gentleman from New York have delighted audiences throughout the world. He justly enjoys the reputation of being one of the world's great orators; but we are dealing with a very practical question to-day.

First of all, may I advert to the provisions of the rule that have been mentioned in this discussion? The provision about which some questions have been asked and the only provision, I think, that has been criticized by gentlemen on the other side of the House is that provision that went into the rule by way of an amendment providing that any appropriation carried in the bill should not be subject to a point of order. That gives the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union an opportunity to pass upon that provision in the bill rather than the presiding officer, whoever he may be, during the consideration of the bill. Without that provision there is no question that a point of order would be made and that the Chair would pass upon it, and that he would, in all human probability, sus-

tain the point of order. Leaving the proposition in the bill for consideration permits the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to say whether or not that provision as it is or as it may be amended shall remain in the bill. That is the whole thing, so far as that is concerned, and it is not depriving the House of any of its privileges or relieving it of its duties.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] criticizes the rule for limiting the time for considering the bill for amendments under the five-minute rule. The Committee on Rules has taken into account the number of pages in the bill, the debatable questions involved in the bill, and the number of amendments which were threatened—over 800—as a means of filibustering against the final passage of the bill. It was thought desirable by those responsible for the procedure in the House of Representatives that the consideration of this bill should be concluded before Thursday of next week. In order to do that the rule gave three days for the consideration of amendments. Now, there is no man in the House of Representatives who will say that germane or proper amendments to this bill, to any and all sections of it, may not be offered within that time. If gentlemen had 800 amendments for the purpose of filibustering against the final passage of the bill, that, of course, would make it impossible to reach all of the bill; but I assume that no such attempt will be made now, because the whole question of amendments is thrown open to the House, not alone to the committee in charge of the bill but to the membership, and the committee in charge of the bill has taken the amendments that it considered necessary and has incorporated them as a part of the bill and reintroduced the bill under another number in order to give the House the time for the consideration of the bill for amendments, as provided in the rule.

Now, just a word upon the condition that confronts us.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am sorry I can not yield. I have not the time.

No one can state as well as the President stated yesterday the situation that confronts the Congress and the American people at this time with respect to our shipping. If this were an original proposition I would not be here to-day and you would not be here to-day listening to me urging a special rule for the consideration of a bill providing for the adoption of a policy of this character. But we are here to deal with a concrete condition that exists in the country. We have over \$3,000,000,000 worth of shipping property that must be dealt with by the Congress. The Executive can not deal with it without authority from us. That \$3,000,000,000 worth of property is diminishing in value hour by hour. Over a thousand of the fifteen hundred ships that we have are at anchor, chained together, deteriorating in value every day, every week, every month, and every year, and it is only a question of a very short time until they will be absolutely valueless. Shall we do something to salvage that property? Shall we take up a bill that proposes a means of restoring that motionless fleet to the sea, of utilizing it, or shall we simply say that we refuse to take up the question at all? If we refuse to consider the question at all we admit the absolute impotence of the Congress to deal with such questions. I am not committed to the provisions of this bill. If any suggestion is made by any of the opponents of the bill, I am ready to give to such suggestion all the consideration to which it is entitled. I suggest that no man occupying the position of a statesman in the Congress of the United States can justify himself before the country or his constituents by simply saying, "I am opposed to this measure." He must say, "I am opposed to this measure because I have a better proposition to offer." If that better proposition is offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] or by any other gentleman I will vote for it. I will vote for it on a motion to recommit, I will vote for it as a substitute for this bill during its consideration, but the country is entitled to the work of statesmen in the consideration of this bill rather than the work of mere politicians. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suppose the gentleman is in the former class.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am going to vote my convictions, not as a politician but as I think the question before us affects the welfare of the whole country. I have voted for river and harbor appropriations, knowing that my constituents did not have a ship, were not interested as stockholders in a ship that would enter a port or sail into a harbor. I see no difference in principle between providing harbor facilities for the shipping interests of the country and providing that our own ships may use these facilities. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Would the gentleman favor a subsidy for steamboats that operate on the rivers that we improve?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have not come to that. If I ever have the opportunity, which is not at all probable, I will consider that question. I will not dodge it when it arises. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, all great nations have sought the seas. Our Nation in the past has been able to expend its energies and invest its capital on the land. We are now a continent thickly inhabited by one hundred millions of people, and we reach the sea on three sides. It is as important to this Nation to-day as to any of the great nations of the past, or any great nations of the present, that our ships should sail the seven seas carrying outward and inward commerce, and in order to do that we must meet such competition as the other nations that sail those seas offer us. Every other great nation having ships upon the sea gives government aid to its shipping interests. Whether that be a subsidy, or whatever it may be, they give the aid.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 10, page 1, strike out the words "controlled and" and insert, after the word "equally," the words "between those in favor of and those opposing the bill and shall be controlled."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "member" insert "opposed to the bill."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 15, strike out the word "that" and insert the word "than" after the word "later."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 6 add the words "that in the consideration of the bill any appropriations made in the bill shall not be subject to a point of order."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POU) there were 124 yeas and 71 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 110, not voting 121, as follows:

YEAS—200.

Ackerman	Ellis	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor
Anderson	Evans	Kahn	Ogden
Andrew, Mass.	Fairchild	Kearns	Paige
Andrews, Nebr.	Fairfield	Kelly, Pa.	Parker, N. J.
Anthony	Faust	Ketcham	Parker, N. Y.
Appleby	Fenn	Kirkpatrick	Patterson, Mo.
Arentz	Fess	Kissel	Patterson, N. J.
Atkeson	Fish	Kline, N. Y.	Perkins
Bacharach	Fitzgerald	Kline, Pa.	Perlman
Beedy	Foster	Knutson	Petersen
Begg	French	Kraus	Radcliffe
Benham	Frothingham	Langley	Ransley
Bixler	Fuller	Larson, Minn.	Reber
Bond	Funk	Lawrence	Reece
Bowers	Gensman	Layton	Reed, N. Y.
Britten	Gerner	Lea, Calif.	Reed, W. Va.
Brooks, Pa.	Gifford	Lee, N. Y.	Ricketts
Burdick	Glynn	Leibach	Riddick
Burtness	Goodykoontz	Lineberger	Roach
Butler	Gorman	Little	Robertson
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	Longworth	Robison
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	McDuffie	Rodenberg
Cannon	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rogers
Chalmers	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rose
Chindblom	Greene, Vt.	McPherson	Sanders, Ind.
Christopherson	Griest	MacGregor	Sanders, N. Y.
Clarke, N. Y.	Hadley	MacLafferty	Scott, Mich.
Cole, Iowa	Haugen	Madden	Shelton
Cole, Ohio	Hawley	Magee	Shreve
Connolly, Pa.	Hays	Mann	Siegel
Cooper, Ohio	Hersey	Mapes	Sinnott
Cooper, Wis.	Hickey	Merritt	Slemp
Coughlin	Hicks	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Crago	Hill	Miller	Snell
Cramton	Himes	Mills	Snyder
Crowther	Hoch	Millsbaugh	Speaks
Curry	Hogan	Mondell	Sprout
Dale	Huck	Moore, Ill.	Stephens
Dallinger	Hukriede	Moore, Ind.	Strong, Kans.
Darrow	Humphrey, Nebr.	Morgan	Strong, Pa.
Dempsey	Husted	Murphy	Summers, Wash.
Dyer	Hutchinson	Nelson, Me.	Swing
Echols	Ireland	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, Tenn.
Edmonds	Jeffers, Nebr.	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Elliott	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norton	Tilson

Timberlake
Tinker
Tinkham
Underhill
Vaile

Vestal
Volk
Volstead
Walters
Ward, N. Y.

Watson
Webster
Williams, Ill.
Williamson
Winslow

Wood, Ind.
Wurzbach
Wyant
Yates
Young

NAYS—110.

Abernethy
Almon
Aswell
Bankhead
Beck
Bland, Va.
Blanton
Boies
Bowling
Box
Briggs
Browne, Wis.
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Byrnes, S. C.
Cantrill
Carew
Carter
Clague
Cockran
Collier
Collins
Connally, Tex.
Crisp
Davis, Tenn.
Deal
Dickinson
Dominick

Doughton
Dowell
Drewry
Driver
Favrot
Fields
Fisher
Frear
Fulmer
Garner
Garrett, Tenn.
Gilbert
Goldsborough
Hammer
Harrison
Hayden
Hooker
Huddleston
Hull
James
Jeffers, Ala.
Jones, Tex.
Keller
Kincheloe
Kopp
Kunz
Lampert
Lanham

Lankford
Larsen, Ga.
Lazaro
Lee, Ga.
Linthicum
Logan
London
Lowrey
Lyon
McClintic
Mansfield
Martin
Montague
Moore, Va.
Nelson, J. M.
O'Brien
Oldfield
Oliver
Park, Ga.
Parks, Ark.
Pou
Quin
Rainey, Ala.
Raker
Rankin
Rayburn
Rouse
Rucker

Sabath
Sanders, Tex.
Sandlin
Sears
Sinclair
Sisson
Smithwick
Steagall
Stedman
Stevenson
Summers, Tex.
Tague
Ten Eyck
Tillman
Townner
Tucker
Turner
Tyson
Upshaw
Vinson
Voigt
Wilson
Wingo
Wise
Woods, Va.
Wright

NOT VOTING—121.

Ansorge
Barbour
Barkley
Bell
Bird
Black
Blakeney
Bland, Ind.
Brand
Brennan
Brooks, Ill.
Brown, Tenn.
Burke
Burroughs
Burton
Byrns, Tenn.
Cable
Chandler, N. Y.
Chandler, Okla.
Clark, Fla.
Classon
Clouse
Codd
Colton
Copley
Cullen
Davis, Minn.
Denison
Drane
Dunbar
Dunn

Dupré
Focht
Fordney
Free
Freeman
Gahn
Gallivan
Garrett, Tex.
Gould
Griffin
Hardy, Colo.
Hardy, Tex.
Hawes
Henry
Herrick
Hudspeth
Humphreys, Miss.
Jacoway
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, Miss.
Jones, Pa.
Kelley, Mich.
Kendall
Kennedy
Kless
Kindred
King
Kitchin
Klecicka
Knight
Kreider

Leatherwood
Luce
Luhling
McArthur
McCormick
McFadden
McKenzie
McLaughlin, Nebr.
McSwain
Maloney
Mead
Michaelson
Montoya
Moore, Ohio
Morin
Mott
Mudd
Newton, Mo.
Olpp
Osborne
Overstreet
Porter
Pringley
Purnell
Rainey, Ill.
Ramseyer
Rhodes
Riordan
Rosenbloom
Rossdale
Ryan

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Dunbar (for) with Mr. Brand (against).
Mr. Kiess (for) with Mr. Williams of Texas (against).
Mr. Purnell (for) with Mr. Black (against).
Mr. Burton (for) with Mr. Taylor of Colorado (against).
Mr. Morin (for) with Mr. McKenzie (against).
Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Kitchin (against).
Mr. Focht (for) with Mr. Byrns of Tennessee (against).
Mr. Woodruff (for) with Mr. Bell (against).
Mr. Olpp (for) with Mr. Weaver (against).
Mr. Kreider (for) with Mr. Garrett of Texas (against).
Mr. Bland of Indiana (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).
Mr. Gahn (for) with Mr. Ward of North Carolina (against).
Mr. Free (for) with Mr. McSwain (against).
Mr. Taylor of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Thomas (against).
Mr. Cable (for) with Mr. Rainey of Illinois (against).
Mr. White of Kansas (for) with Mr. Jacoway (against).
Mr. Rhodes (for) with Mr. Barkley (against).
Mr. Newton of Missouri (for) with Mr. Hudspeth (against).
Until further notice:

Mr. Porter with Mr. Riordan.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Swank.
Mr. Hardy of Colorado with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Barbour with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Mott with Mr. Hardy of Texas.
Mr. Luce with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Denison with Mr. Dupré.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Mead.
 Mr. King with Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi.
 Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Stoll.
 Mr. Mudd with Mr. Kindred.
 Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Overstreet.
 Mr. Osborne with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

BLINDED, ARMLESS, AND LEGLESS VETERANS.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8062) amending subdivision 5a of section 302 of the war risk insurance act, with Senate amendments thereto, and move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill H. R. 8062, on the Speaker's table, with Senate amendments, and moves to concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman please give us a brief statement of what the Senate amendments are?

Mr. FISH. The original bill called for an increase in pay from \$20 to \$50 per month for the nurses and attendants of the blinded, armless, and legless veterans, and other totally disabled veterans of the World War. The Senate amendment simply strikes out the words "all other totally disabled veterans" and leaves the bill to apply to the blinded, legless, and armless, who number about 300. I am willing to concur with the Senate amendment, although I would prefer the more comprehensive terms of the original bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There was one amendment which the Clerk read that strikes out \$50 and inserts \$20, as I understood it. To what does that relate?

Mr. FISH. That must be an error in reading.

Mr. BLANTON. The Clerk read such an amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding with respect to this matter, and I shall withdraw my request until to-morrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KLECZKA, until Friday, on account of death in family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. TIMBERLAKE to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Mr. Smith Gee, H. R. 2963, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, November 23, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

705. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing the amount of pay and allowances by ranks and ratings for officers and enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

706. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill for the relief of the Turner Construction Co., of New York City; to the Committee on Claims.

707. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports of certain named bureaus and offices showing the exchanges during the fiscal year 1922 for labor-saving devices and report of the Chief of Engineers showing exchanges that were made during that year for all the districts of the Engineer Department at large; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12862) to pension soldiers and sailors of the World War, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPROUL: A bill (H. R. 12892) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, the county of Cook, or the city of Chicago, separately or jointly, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12893) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Gloucester City, N. J., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 12894) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Magnolia, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 12895) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Menasha, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 12896) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12897) to provide for the erection of a Federal building on the site owned by the Government of the United States and located in the city of Racine, State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12898) granting a pension to Sarah C. Ubil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12899) for the relief of Catherine Woods; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12900) granting a pension to Henry F. Clement; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 12901) granting an increase of pension to Hulda J. Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12902) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia R. Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 12903) granting a pension to William Kirk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12904) granting an increase of pension to Dorrance Shomo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIMES: A bill (H. R. 12905) granting a pension to Catharine Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 12906) granting a pension to Delnora Deuel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12907) granting a pension to Carrie M. Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 12908) granting a pension to Charlotte E. Rockhold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12909) granting a pension to Ann Katherine Kindred; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12910) granting a pension to Martha White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12911) granting a pension to Mary A. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12912) to correct the military record of George W. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12913) granting a pension to Mary Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 12914) granting a pension to Cora E. La Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 12915) for the examination and survey of Highcliff Harbor, Lake Winnebago, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 12916) granting a pension to James C. Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12917) granting a pension to Mary A. Hatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 12918) granting a pension to Mary E. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 12919) granting a pension to William G. Glasgow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12920) granting a pension to Harry E. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARK of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12921) for the relief of the Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 12922) granting an increase of pension to Martha Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12923) granting a pension to Frances E. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12924) granting a pension to Agnes Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12925) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12926) granting an increase of pension to James G. Shockley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12927) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12928) granting an increase of pension to John E. Crum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 12929) for the relief of Harry Evans Nowland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12930) for the relief of Chesley P. Key; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 12931) granting a pension to Cora F. Marlette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 12932) granting a pension to Theresa Gerughty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12933) granting a pension to Nancy J. Cady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12934) granting a pension to Julia A. Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12935) granting an increase of pension to Natalia Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 12936) granting an increase of pension to James P. Aney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12937) granting a pension to Isabel Newton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12938) granting a pension to Simon H. Drum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 12939) granting a pension to Mary A. Hird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12940) granting a pension to Sophia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12941) granting a pension to John H. Boyd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 12942) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12943) for the relief of James L. Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12944) for the relief of James H. Lomasney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12945) for the relief of John J. Corcoran; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12946) granting a pension to William Smallwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 12947) granting a pension to Charles H. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12948) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Kimbrough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 12949) granting a pension to Clara H. Farnsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 12950) granting an increase of pension to Charles Arthur Bordeaux; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12951) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6428. By Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 12898, granting a pension to Sarah C. Ubil; to the Committee on Pensions.

6429. By Mr. CRISP: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Georgia, urging the repeal of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6430. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolution of First Baptist Church of Mount Morris, Mich., indorsing proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6431. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the American Legion national legislative committee, Washington, D. C., favoring ad-

justed compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6432. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Miss Minnie Provis, of Sutter Creek, Calif., urging support of the Bursum pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6433. Also, petition of Roy M. Marks, of Placerville, Calif., relative to the transportation question; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6434. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs committee on Indian welfare, Riverside, Calif., relative to Senate bill 3855; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6435. Also, petition of the Cannerymen's League of California, San Francisco, Calif., urging Federal action toward the protection of the lower Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6436. Also, petition of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Oakland, Calif., urging an appropriation for improving San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6437. Also, petition of Bakersfield Civic Commercial Association, Bakersfield, Calif., indorsing the Britten-Ladd metric standards bill; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

6438. Also, petition of the American Legion national legislative committee, Washington, D. C., urging support of the American Legion plan for adjusted compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6439. Also, petitions of Robert L. Hanley, commander of Victory Post, American Legion, Los Angeles, Calif., urging support of Senator King's resolution to investigate the Veterans' Bureau; Bakersfield Civic Commercial Association, Bakersfield, Calif., indorsing the Capper-French truth in fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6440. Also, petitions of the Garden Club of America, California zone, and the Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles, Calif., against the passage of the "all year national park bill"; also petition of East San Diego Chamber of Commerce, East San Diego, Calif., urging support of the development of the lower Colorado Basin; also petition of Selma Chamber of Commerce, Selma, Calif., urging support of the Barbour bill, creating the Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6441. By Mr. MURPHY: Memorial of Martins Ferry Woman's Club, Martins Ferry, Ohio, favoring freedom for Christian people of eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6442. Also, petition of Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Reformed Church of Christ, and Lutheran Churches, in Carrollton, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 9753, the Sunday law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6443. Also, memorial of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Amsterdam, Ohio, favoring independence for the Christian people of the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6444. Also, petition of Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal churches at Malvern, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 9753, the Sunday law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6445. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Gridley Chapter, No. 324, Order of the Eastern Star, Erie, Pa., favoring passage of the Towner-Sterling bill (H. R. 7; S. 1252); to the Committee on Education.

6446. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the First Baptist Church of Kittanning, Pa., indorsing House Joint Resolution 159, proposing a constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6447. Also, petition of East Brady (Pa.) Chapter, No. 311, Order of the Eastern Star, favoring the enactment of the Towner-Sterling bill (H. R. 7; S. 1252); to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, November 23, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the land in which we live, for all its history toward right and truth. We bless Thee for the heritage thus given unto us and ask that righteousness may exalt the Nation, and along the track of the future Thy good pleasure may be realized and the desires of the people be such as shall meet with Thine acceptance. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

WESLEY L. JONES, a Senator from the State of Washington; HENRY L. MYERS, a Senator from the State of Montana; and